The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1896.

The Week.

THE honest people of Vermont have earned the hearty gratitude of the country, and the returns indicate that the credit is due in equal shares to Republicans and Democrats. There is not the slightest evidence that a single Republican voter deserted his party on the free-silver issue, and thousands of Republicans who would ordinarily not have voted must have determined that the present crisis demanded an unusual exertion. It is idle for the Bryan party to assert that no effort was made to influence the vote of Vermont for free silver. The Populist candidate for Governor, a man of considerable wealth, has for a number of months been actively engaged in distributing free-silver documents throughout the State. He owns a newspaper in which he has published the speeches of Teller and Tillman and Bryan and their like, and has proclaimed that this silver literature should be placed in the hands of every voter in Vermont. Speakers were engaged in behalf of the silver cause who went nearly everywhere in the State, and it was openly boasted that the farmers were thoroughly posted on the matter and would show it at the election; a boast which seems to have been quite justified by the event. It must not be forgotten that the Vermont farmers have suffered of recent years probably quite as much as those of the West. They have had almost to give away their sheep, their horses have been unsalable, their butter has never brought so little, their potatoes could not be sold last year for enough to pay their freight, and in Vermont if anywhere the promise of higher prices might have been expected to draw farmers to the silver cause. But when it came to getting higher prices by national dishonor, the Vermont farmers arose with righteous indignation and smote the enemy hip and thigh.

It is especially gratifying to see that fully 25 per cent. of the Democrats not only refused to support the candidate of their own party, but followed the advice of Mr. Phelps and voted the Republican ticket. It is of course impossible to prove this assertion positively, but it is quite incredible that there were 15,000 Republicans not usually voting who were drawn out on this occasion, and it is altogether reasonable to believe that at least 5,000 Democrats voted for maintaining the honor of the country. Considering the tenacity to party which has always characterized the Vermont Democrats, it seems probable that the Chicago platform and candidates will in some States not obtain half the regular Democratic vote.

The law which governs State elections in Arkansas is theoretically a good one. The Governor, Secretary of State, and Attorney-General, as a State election board, appoint three commissioners for each county, whose duty is to appoint three judges and two clerks for each voting precinct. The law provides that the county boards shall not be all of the same political party, and that the judges of election shall not be all of the same political party "when competent and discreet persons" can be found of the opposite party. But as a majority controls the action of the county board, the two Democratic Commissioners always appointed can use the provision regarding "competent and discreet persons" to rule out all but members of their own party, or to name as representatives of the Opposition ignorant or mercenary men. This is what has been done this year. The fact seems to be established that in a dozen counties where the Republican strength is greatest, the Democratic majority of the county election boards ignored the nomination of the Republican member of the board, and refused to appoint the man suggested by him in each precinct, and, instead, either appointed all the election officers from the Democratic party, or selected men claiming to be Republicans, but not regarded as such, or as being trustworthy, by the Republicans of the county. Of course there could be but one motive for such action. The Democratic managers proposed to make the count in these counties what they chose, without reference to the way the ballots were actually cast. Charges of gross fraud are already made, and there is no reason to doubt that such charges are well founded. Under these circumstances the size of the majority for the Democratic ticket (some 60,000) possesses absolutely no significance.

The quality and temper of the Indianapolis convention were alike remarkable. It is not too much to say that the delegates represented the intelligence and character of the Democratic party more fully than any regular convention of recent years has done. They were chosen because of their character, rather than selected because the machine decided to have them go. There were few of the regular Boys among them, and the usual Tammany contingent, which lowers the average of any body it sits in tremendously, was not present. The convention was made up entirely of men who were in it because their convictions took them there. They believed in definite principles so profoundly that they were willing to defy "party regularity" in order to maintain them. The vigor and force of their convictions were shown by the frankness with which they expressed their honest opinions of Mr. Bryan and the platform upon which he stands. The ticket presents a very striking contrast to that nominated at Chicago. Messrs. Palmer and Buckner come before the people weighted with years and honors. Both have shown in military and civil life qualities which have commanded the respect and admiration of their fellow-men. They have been tried and found worthy in various fields of public service. Senator Palmer was a brave and distinguished Union soldier in the civil war; was afterwards Republican Governor of Illinois, and in more recent years has been a Democratic Senator from the same State. He was a Democrat before the war, and, after a few years of association with the Republicans during and after the war, returned to his former political affiliations because he could not approve Republican tendency toward federal centralization. In all positions he has shown the same qualities of unswerving devotion to principle, of clear and strong intelligence, and of genuine patriotism. Gen. Buckner's career has shown like qualities. He was a brave Confederate soldier, and has served in recent years as Governor of Kentucky. He was in retirement when his party in Kentucky became infatuated with the silver craze, and immediately took the field in opposition to it. No man has ever questioned his courage or his honesty, and, like Senator Palmer, he has shown, in every position which he has held, those abilities and attributes which command the respect and confidence of men.

How can any Democrat of intelligence and character hesitate for a moment between these two representatives of all that is best and worthy in their party and Bryan and Watson or Bryan and Sewall? Bryan is a harum-scarum young man of thirty-six who has been in several professions, making no mark in any, and leaving behind him in all no impression of either strong ability or steadfast character. He is something of a lawyer, a little of a journalist, and more of a politician than either. His speeches leave no doubt in any trained mind that he is only a half-educated man. He is worse than untried, for he has been tried and found wanting. He is going about the country pouring forth at every railway station silly and ignorant talk about finance, currency, government, syndicates, railways, bankers, and property-owners. All that is stable in the country, all that has tended to its development as a civilized state, he denounces and promises as President to overturn and destroy. His associate on the ticket who will be most generally supported with him is Tom Watson, a roaring, ignorant demagogue who is totally unfit for any public office, and whose

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomination would have been possible in no national convention except one which represented the discontent and ignorance of the land. That any self-respecting Democrat should under any conditions persuade himself that he could vote for such a party ticket as this, when a really admirable one is in the field for his support, passes comprehension.

The importance of putting a check to the extravagance of Congress, as recommended by the Indianapolis platform, is very well shown by a recent publication of the Treasury Bureau of Statistics. In this publication, the receipts, expenditures, and debt of the United States, from 1789 to 1896, are exhibited, together with the annual appropriations from 1873 to the present time. One of the diagrams shows that the net expenditures of the Government declined pretty steadily from 1868 to 1878, and rose gradually again until they were in 1888 about what they were in 1867. By 1893 they had increased nearly 75 per cent., and have since declined very little. The pensions are responsible for a large part of this, but the new navy and "miscellaneous" appropriations have had much to do with it. Another diagram shows in a startling way the increase of appropriations per capita. In 1885 they amounted to about $2.50 per head, while in 1892 the average had risen to $5.20. By examining the diagram showing the receipts of the Government, we see that the increase of these receipts has had the effect of stimulating the appropriations of Congress after a short time; the enlarged appropriations generally beginning at about the time when the revenue began to fall off. During the earlier years of the century the total gross expenditures varied to a surprising extent. From 1840 to 1846 they hardly rose above $30,000,000, but in 1847 and 1848 (during the Mexican war) they were $60,000,000, falling below $50,000,000 in 1850-'52. In 1854 they were $75,000,000, and but $77,000,000 in 1860. In 1865 they reached the enormous figure of $1,906,000,000, and since 1868 they have averaged roughly about ten times what they were before the war. These gross expenditures are swollen, of course, by payments of the interest and principal of the public debt, but the net expenditures are approximately double what they were twenty years ago. Considering what we have suffered in the way of pernicious legislation, our Congress is a pretty expensive body to maintain.

The *Tribune* announces that "a heavy deficit in August confronts the party which has reduced the tariff," and asserts "that it is absolutely necessary to raise more revenue," and that the only way it can be raised is either a "heavier tax on beer or different duties on imports." The answer is that it is unlikely that any change in the tariff can be made for at least a year, and that it is unlikely that any change can be made even in a year, so long as the Senate is composed as at present. To get a new or changed tariff now through the Senate, both the Republican party and Mr. McKinley would have to violate their vows not "to do something for silver." That is, they would have "to do something for silver," and that something would have to be something that would hinder or prevent the maintenance of the gold standard. The Senate would not be content with anything less. Consequently all discussion of the tariff in the present canvass is not simply confusing to the public, but futile. The one topic is now and has been from the beginning the currency. Supposing, however, the question of revenue to be an important one, no discussion of revenue in the case of a nation any more than of an individual, is proper without discussion also of expenditure. No honest man ever thinks of asking, "How much money do I need?" without also asking, "How much money must I spend?" The same thing is true of a nation. Every country possessed of respectable and orderly finance always links income and expenditure. It bases expenditure, as every prudent man does, on income. Our last two Congresses have started on a course unknown since the establishment of constitutional government. They have voted expenditures without any reference to income. The last river and harbor appropriation was even voted out of an empty treasury. In other words, they have wilfully made deficits, just like any careless young spendthrift. So that to expect us to cast about for increased sources of income without ever asking whether an expenditure is not too great—that is, whether we cannot make ends meet by reducing our expenses—is a little too much. All, or nearly all, our difficulties are due to reckless outlay, indulged in during the past few years for the sole purpose of making a high tariff seem necessary. This is not the time to go again over this sorrowful tale.

The "yardstick argument" used by Mr. Bryan in one of his speeches in Ohio discloses in a way that is almost startling the confusion that prevails in his mind concerning the most elementary principles of monetary science. He said, in reply to the argument that it was impossible to have two yardsticks of different lengths or two dollars of different values, that there was no analogy between the cases. To make the comparison perfect, he said, it would be necessary to have a yardstick made out of some material that would grow longer or shorter under varying conditions. But that, Mr. Bryan very correctly observed, would be a very bad kind of a yardstick. It would lead to incessant quarrelling over the standard of measure. The man who was buying would insist on using the long yardstick, and the man who was selling would want the short yardstick, and instead of trading they would come to blows. The most obvious inference from these premises is certainly that a varying dollar would be worse than a varying yardstick. Whenever there has been any doubt as to the value of money, the very evils described by Mr Bryan have always taken place. The financial history of every people is largely made up of the record of the disputes and mischiefs that have arisen from the use of money that had been tampered with, in one way and another, by the Government. But the inference that Mr. Bryan drew was that the amount of money should be fixed by legislation. According to his theory, "the toiling masses who produce the wealth of the nation" would adopt legislation in favor of "a dollar that will keep pace with property." The experiment has been often tried, generally with the claim that the toiling masses wanted it, but the dollar never seems to keep pace well when legislators take it in hand. They can produce a varying "legal-tender," but they cannot make gold change its place in the estimation of men.

One cannot read Mr. Schurz's masterly speech at Chicago on Saturday evening without recalling the old simile of "using dynamite to split a pumpkin," for surely never before was such power and lucidity of statement, such weight of argument, such patient marshalling of facts brought to bear upon so weak a subject as Mr. Bryan. All his ignorant and silly assertions are exposed and refuted with such care and thoroughness that one marvels at the orator's patience in continuing his task to the end. In fact, the most extraordinary feature of the present campaign is the amount of time and energy that all the forces of intelligence and civilization are called upon to devote to the elucidation of rudimentary truths and principles which ought to be taught in every schoolroom. Mr. Bryan and his disciples have turned the whole country into a primary school, and made it necessary for all of us to go into the business of teaching the multiplication table and other elementary courses of instruction to 70,000,000 of people. Mr. Schurz puts the case well in the following passage:

"However, the ultimate result is not at all uncertain. After a period of infinite confusion, disaster, humiliation, suffering, and misery the American people will at last regain sanity of mind and arrive again at some very simple conclusions: That, if you call a peck a bushel, you will have more bushels, but not more grain; if you call a foot a yard, you will have more yards, but not more cloth; if you call a square rod an acre, you will have more acres, but not more land; and if you call 50 cents, or 1 cent, or a bit of paper a dollar, you will have more dollars, but not more wealth—indeed, a great deal less chance of wealth, for you will have far less credit, because far less honesty. We shall then have learned again that the wit of man cannot—although insanity tries very hard—invent an economic system under which everything you have to sell will be dear and everything you have to buy will be cheap. And having got

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold of these very simple truths, the American people will then in sackcloth and ashes repent of this insane free-coinage debauch."

Mr. David A. Wells contributes to the literature of the campaign, through the *Tribune* of Monday, a remarkably forcible demonstration of the real causes of the fall in prices which the silver advocates attribute to the demonetization of silver in 1873, and to the consequent "appreciation in the value of gold." In the matter of this appreciation we venture to hope that Mr. Wells has made so thorough work now that further refutation will be unnecessary. His demonstration shows that, so far as actual proof is concerned, there has been a depreciation rather than an appreciation during the past twenty years. Mr. Wells makes equally clean work of the other branches of the subject, such as the real causes of the fall in prices, and Senator Jones's real reasons for being a silver advocate; and he disposes of the voluble President of Brown University in this neat manner:

"The fact of it is that the world is confronted with the most remarkable phenomenon that has ever characterized its civilization, and has not yet fully recognized its importance (the least so, apparently, in the United States)—a phenomenon sequential and in harmony with the assertion recently made by the eminent French chemist and economist, M. Berthelot, in an address before an association of European scientists, that practically more has been done for the development of man during the last three quarters of a century than during the preceding 6,000 years. President Andrews of Brown University, who regards free coinage in the light of a panacea for all evils, has caught glimpses of the situation when he expresses the opinion that 'the money question at the present time is the greatest question of civilization.' But he had not sense enough to distinguish an effect from a cause, and so takes rank with an untutored Indian who connects the death of his chief with an eclipse of the moon."

Some of the results of upsetting the standard of value are indicated by the position taken by the leading shipbuilders of the country concerning their bids for constructing new vessels for the navy. It is reported that they have asked the department to postpone the bidding until after the November election, which request has been refused on the ground that the advertisements for proposals had already appeared. Disappointed in this, the shipbuilders now talk of stipulating for gold payments in their contracts; but they can hardly believe that Mr. Bryan's Secretary of the Navy will carry out any contracts of that description, even if their legality were certain. The shipbuilders have contracts already on hand the completion of which will require years, and they are naturally nervous at the possibility of inflated prices for materials. Of course there is but one thing to do if they are going to bid at all on these contracts, and that is to put their prices high enough to secure a profit if we come down to a silver basis. Then if we do they cannot lose; while if we maintain the gold standard, they will gain enormously. This is but a repetition of what took place when the Government began to issue fiat money during the war. It raised prices against itself prodigiously, and ran into debt a thousand millions more than it needed because it had hurt its own credit. All these bills, of course, are eventually paid by the poor and ignorant people whom Mr. Bryan is trying to persuade to look for prosperity in the ruin of their employers.

The parliamentary committee of the Trades Union Congress, which began its sessions in Edinburgh on Monday, "blames" the Tories for not having passed a single measure "in the interest of labor," and for even preventing private members of Parliament from promoting such measures. This seems to be a shaft aimed at Mr. Chamberlain's bosom, as he was the man most lavish in promises of what he and Salisbury were going to do for the workingmen. But the latter should consider how many things Mr. Chamberlain has had to occupy him in the process of developing England's "colonial estate." The first thing he did was to stir up an exceedingly bad neighbor in the person of old Krüger, who looked angrily over the hedge and said that this developing of estates was all mighty fine, but that developing of other people's estates was one of the things he proposed to draw the line at. Then the worried Colonial Secretary had to devote himself to his grand scheme for an imperial zollverein, in order to see it condemned by the best financial authorities at home, and coolly received or openly flouted by the colonies themselves. How could a man with these great problems on his hands be expected to remember all he had said about old-age pensions and workingmen's insurance? Both he and Mr. Balfour now say they are going to do better after the grouse-shooting is over. But the trades-unionists are evidently sceptical about this. On the other hand, they doubt if it is "prudent" for them to have anything more to do with international socialist congresses, after the lamentable exhibition given by the last one in London. Cut off thus from both parliamentary action and radical agitation, the gloomy prospect is before the trades-unions of being compelled to discuss prosaic matters such as work and wages and coöperation and fraternal societies and the improvement of the morale and discipline of workingmen. The other is much more ideal and enlivening, but this is, after all, the way to fill the pocket and the stomach.

The Royal Commission of thirteen, which has been sitting for three years on the subject of Irish taxation, has made its report. The Commission is composed mainly of Englishmen, and contains such men as Lord Farrer. It has reported, by ten out of the thirteen, that England has regularly been taking from Ireland each year for fifty years about $13,750,000 more than her due proportion through a government carried on for most of the time by Englishmen, hostile to or ignorant of the country. The question what is now to be done is the hardest Irish nut Parliament has to crack, far harder than any produced by O'Connell or Parnell. It shows that England owes Ireland £100,000,000 sterling. What is to be done? Pay the debt or ignore it?

The returns of the census recently taken in France show that the hope that was aroused a few years ago that the decline of the birth-rate had been arrested is not likely to be realized. It was reasoned that the destruction of men in the prime of life at the time of the war with Prussia was still showing its effects, and that in a few years the operation of this cause would cease. But there is no indication of anything more than an insignificant growth in population, and, what is especially grievous, the increase due to immigration forms a large part of this. The French newspapers are now embarrassed with the problem of providing colonists for their colonies. They have plenty of colonies, which cost a great deal of money and the lives of many soldiers, but if Frenchmen will not multiply sufficiently to keep up the population at home, it is certainly a doubtful policy to encourage them to go abroad. If they emigrated from France, their places would undoubtedly be filled by Italians and Germans and Belgians, so that the condition of the population would be more unsatisfactory than ever. As a correspondent points out, the usual speculations as to the cause of the growing sterility of the French race are indulged in by the European journals, but they seem to attach insufficient importance to the frightful burden of governmental expenditure. The debt of France has grown by leaps and bounds, and, in spite of some feeble efforts to check extravagance, every year shows a large deficit in the budget. New taxes are continually devised, inheritance taxes, income taxes, and Government monopolies, the effect of which can only be to increase the revenue of the Government by diminishing that of its subjects. But it is notorious that no people in the world is so anxious to provide well for its children as the French, and if the share of the tax-gatherer in all earnings is continually increased, the share of posterity must be diminished. We venture to say that, if the truth could be got at, the French parent reasons that if he cannot leave property enough to provide comfortably for three children, he will not leave three children to be provided for. There have been many instances in history where population has declined under the pressure of taxation, and there is no reason why France should be an exception.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLATFORM OF THE GOLD DEMOCRATS.

NOT since the two Republican platforms of 1856 and 1860 has there been any party deliverance so businesslike and so free from claptrap as that adopted by the gold Democrats on Thursday in Indianapolis. We do not recall any platform which contains in so succinct a form a description of the American government and a statement of the principles of sound currency. In both these particulars it is superior to that of the Republicans; but we must remember how times have changed since the Republican platform was drawn. Politicians, although they loudly demand trust in the people, rarely do trust them. It now appears pretty plain that the Republicans so late as June had but small knowledge, if any, of what was passing in the mind of the public. The candidate was thinking of nothing but protection, and was afraid not only to declare openly for a gold standard, but to use the word "gold." The result was that the platform fell a good deal behind popular sentiment in clearness and directness and emphasis.

This cannot be said of the Indianapolis platform. The gold Democrats have found within a few weeks that they cannot call too loudly for the gold standard as the standard of the civilized world, in order to satisfy the public. There is no compromise or placating in their attitude. They do not bargain; they proclaim. Their utterances, too, on the tariff, on the condition of our shipping, on the extravagant expenditures of Congress, on civil-service reform and currency reform, on international arbitration, and on the Supreme Court, are fully up to the latest modern thought on these subjects. Possibly, it may be said, we should not have obtained from them so clear and excellent a statement of their views if they had expected to win; but we must nevertheless thank them for the credit and honor they have done to American politics, by laying before the world the best thought of rational Americans on the great questions of national polity. At this crisis, when so much nonsense is talked and written by people who pretend to represent us in the eyes of foreigners, it is a great thing to have the common sense of America produced in plain prose.

The platform denounces

> "the further maintenance of the present costly patchwork system of national paper currency as a constant source of injury and peril, and asserts the necessity of such intelligent currency reform as will confine the Government to its legitimate functions completely separated from the banking business, and afford to all sections of our country a uniform, safe, and elastic banking currency under Government supervision, measured in volume by the needs of business."

This year is the first time any political party has been called on for a plan of positive financial reform, and the great defect of the Republican platform is that it failed to meet this demand—a fact which was pointed out by the London *Economist* at the time of its promulgation. The United States is to-day in the position of a rich man whose affairs have fallen into disorder, partly through his extravagance and partly through bad management, but whose resources are still large, and who has called a meeting of his creditors. Now, if he were to tell them simply that he was determined to keep his credit as untarnished as his honor, that he came of honorable ancestors, and was an honorable man himself, and that if his word was not as good as his bond, he was going to find out the reason why, and said not one word about the ways and means by which he expected to pay his debts, about the amount of his assets, or the way in which he meant to turn them to account, would they not conclude that he was either crazy or meant to fool them? They certainly would. We are making to-day tremendous exertions to assure the world, through every organ we have, that our credit is good and our financial integrity undiminished, but neither the Republican party nor the Bryan party has submitted any plan of reform.

The Republicans have said they are going to keep our honor untarnished by an increased duty on foreign imports, but the last time they tried this they were overwhelmingly defeated at the polls. The Bryanites say they are going to do it by adulterating the coinage and scaling public and private debts. We all say we are going to maintain our existing currency at par in gold, cost what it may. But what the world wants to know is exactly, not in terms of politics, but in terms of business, how we are going to do it. Is it by quarterly loans, or by withdrawing the silver and greenbacks? In short, what the world is waiting for from us, is what is called a "business statement" of our affairs and expectations.

We must be thankful to the Democrats, therefore, for having called for the withdrawal of the greenbacks and the establishment of an elastic banking system, as party doctrine, something for people to vote on and support. This is what the situation demands. It is with this the next Congress should occupy itself first of all. Its chief business should be to place our financial system on a basis of facts and not on a basis of windy rhetoric. The difficulties of this we do not underrate. In every other civilized country, when the Government gets into financial difficulties, it calls into council the leading bankers, exchange brokers, and other men of the country whose business it is to deal with money and maintain credit. They are the experts of the money market. The Minister of Finance asks their advice whether he had better borrow, or tax, or establish institutions of credit, and he takes it just as a man in financial trouble takes the advice of his lawyers or brokers. We, on the contrary, take the opinion of the long-haired men, the shady politicians, the blathering orators, and of nearly every one we can hear of who knows nothing about money or its functions, and who has himself failed in life, and we load the bankers and exchange brokers with abuse. We use the suggestions of the bankers as lists of things which we must on no account do or even talk about. The long-haired men, in fact, recently frightened us so much that we were afraid to say "gold," like naughty children who had been caught cursing.

If we are to get back to civilized finance, this must cease. Money and exchange, and banking and credit, though not mysteries, are among the numerous complications of the wonderful modern world, and those whose business it is to deal with them daily are experts like any others, whose knowledge and experience are of supreme value. The way we have been in the habit of treating them of late years is a characteristic of barbarous communities like Paraguay or Somaliland. Civilized finance cannot be carried on and the credit of a civilized commercial nation be maintained by the first comer. There is little use in supposing that we can get out of our financial slough by consulting Populist farmers, or broken-down politicians, or "boy orators."

DENIS KEARNEY AND W. J. BRYAN.

THE people of the East have been listening of late to a voluble young demagogue from the West, who came to preach a war of classes, and to tell the masses that they are threatened with ruin by good money, since "money," according to this new financial authority, "may be too good" for the poor man. It has been a somewhat surprising experience for the people dwelling east of the Alleghanies, numbering as they do nearly one-third of all the people in the republic, to learn that they live in what a candidate for the Presidency considers "the enemy's country," and to be told that they are engaged in a conspiracy to defraud the other two-thirds.

But we are not this year for the first time hearing a Western demagogue denounce Eastern people who have accumulated any money as public enemies, and prophesy the ruin of the masses if the policy of the Government shall keep all of its currency always as good as gold. Nearly twenty years ago, before specie payments had been resumed, and while the success of that experiment remained to be proved, there came across the continent another demagogue with a mission to those oppressed by the despotism of gold. In the summer of 1878 the ears of Eastern people were assailed with the loud cries of an orator from the Golden Gate, and Denis Kearney appeared in our cities as the rescuer of the down-trodden masses.

A fellow-feeling had irresistibly attracted this demagogue of the San Francisco Sand Lots to the champion dema-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gogue on the Atlantic Coast, and Kearney made his way straight to Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, with whom he held sweet converse in the interest of suffering humanity. The memory of that trip has grown somewhat dim in the minds of men who lived through the period of a depreciated currency, and hundreds of thousands will vote for President next November who were hardly more than babies then. It is well, therefore, to recall some of Kearney's speeches in 1878, and to show how perfect a prototype he then was of the William J. Bryan of 1896.

Kearney reached Boston on the 28th of July, and began speaking as soon as he had left the train. He informed his "fellow-workingmen of Boston" that he brought "glad tidings," having "left the plains of California strewn with the festering carcasses of public plunderers." He declared that his "simple mission was to address the horny-handed sons of toil," and that he had "proclaimed from the inception of this movement death to the machine politicians, death to the thieving capitalists, and death upon death to the murdering, plundering land-pirates." Of course Kearney was bitter against the press. He took occasion to "thank God that I am not a man who was made by the newspapers," and announced that he "despised the corrupt, monopoly-fostering press of the United States." He denounced the "murdering monopolists, who are day by day grinding the workingmen in the East," but comforted the miserable victims by the assurance that "we propose to ameliorate the condition of the laboring men."

On the 5th of August Kearney spoke in Faneuil Hall, and there was "one of the largest gatherings ever held within and around its walls." The Sand Lots orator had met Butler in the presence of a reporter, who furnished the press a verbatim report of the conference between these two unselfish men upon the best means of righting the wrongs of the masses, and Kearney opened his address in the old cradle of liberty by "bringing a message of greeting and love to the man who is lesser than *Macbeth*, yet greater—to that fiery and incomparable Rupert of debate, to that chivalrous and white-plumed Navarre of the rostrum—gallant, gifted, glorious Butler," who, he hoped, would "receive the reward from the workingmen of Massachusetts he so justly merits for his bold and outspoken action in behalf of downtrodden humanity." At this point, the report reads, Kearney "took off his coat and loosened his cravat." Being thus ready for business, he proceeded in this strain:

"What means this outpouring of people? What means this grand tidal wave? What is the matter with the country, that the workingmen are arising from North to South, from West to East? To do what? To take charge of their own affairs. This vast uprising of the people—what does it mean? Does it not mean death to the railroad robber and the lecherous, thieving bondholder? And does it not mean political oblivion to the rancorous, villanous political bummer?"

Kearney "paid his respects to the press" at length in his usual strain, and concluded as follows:

"I hope you will profit by my advice, which is to pool all your issues—put all your issues into one pot—and next November you will be able to announce victory for the honest workingmen of Massachusetts. Drop all other issues, and get together for bread and butter. All in favor of pooling issues hold up their hands. [All hands were raised.] All opposed. [No sign.] Now I hope no one will state to-morrow that this was not a unanimous meeting—unanimous to fight for a common cause."

On the 12th of August Kearney visited Lynn, Mass., and spoke on the Common to a crowd of about 12,000 persons. "If you take care of your issues," he said to the workingmen, "Massachusetts will be all afire inside of a month. Of course, I don't mean practically, but afire with the love and welfare of the workingman. Workingmen are going to put their soldiers on duty, and simply elect the men they want to live under in Massachusetts. Make all the necessary preparations for entering the White House in 1880."

Of course Kearney was "down" on gold, and in love with the depreciated greenback currency then in use. Equally of course, he was bitterly opposed to the idea of resuming specie payments in 1879, as then proposed by existing law, and perfectly sure that the carrying out of the policy would mean ruin to the masses. He discussed this subject in his New York speech on the 6th of September, delivered in Union Square. He began by declaring that "this is a movement of the American people—a second uprising of the people who have recorded an oath in heaven that they will be free," and that "the question is now in the coming fight between honest men and thieves." He proceeded to commend the Greenback party, and then drew this contrast between gold and greenbacks:

"In our recent trouble, when the American Republic was in danger, what became of gold? What became of the gold of the country in the times of war? Oh, it lowered its cowardly head. Greenbacks were called into requisition, and now why discard greenbacks in times of peace? If they were brave enough to protect you in times of war, why discard them, I ask, in times of peace? Be honest, American workmen! Let me give you a fair estimate of what Shylock wants. The thieving bloodsuckers of labor, who ride in tally-ho coaches, who spend their time in foreign countries, who spend their time and money outside of America, living off the sweat of American labor—when you issue greenbacks you cut off that great army of bloodsuckers at one fell swoop.

"One hundred and thirty-six million dollars is all the money we have got to redeem the greenbacks with. We are supposed to redeem $346,000,000 of greenbacks by $136,000,000 in gold. Then when these Shylocks call upon the Government—and let me tell you that they will use the law and strain the law to get what they want every time—then of course up goes the gold; the gold rushes up to double its present value, and Shylock will declare the American Republic bankrupt if he wants to. This is a business proposition, and I don't propose to discuss that question any further, as every schoolboy knows just as well as I do that resumption means bankruptcy."

The Western demagogue of 1878 was more violent and vulgar in his language than the Western demagogue of 1896, though Bryan is steadily sinking in this respect when he gets to talking about the Creator's not using better mud to make the financier than the laboring man. But in the attempt to array one class against another, in the denunciation of those who have property, in the condemnation of the gold standard, in the praise of cheap money, Denis Kearney was the forerunner of William J. Bryan.

EX-POST-FACTO JUSTICE.

Not many ages ago it was common to inflict torture and confiscation of goods in the cause of religion, and the Reign of Terror in France showed the world what could be perpetrated in the name of liberty. Religion no longer arouses the passions that it once excited, and the abolition of class privileges has lessened the force of appeals to liberty; but the spirit that caused these former cruelties is not extinct, and as it requires some sacred name with which to attract supporters, it has of late taken to invoking justice. Every revolutionary proposal, every attack on property, is supported by the claim that the present social order is unjust, and we are now face to face with a scheme of general confiscation under the guise of a measure of justice to the poor in general and to the oppressed debtor in particular.

The peculiarity of the present outcry is that it is directed against creatures of the imagination. A hideous conspiracy is declared to be in existence, and to have been for a whole generation in existence, but no one ever thinks of naming the conspirators, or of offering anything in the nature of evidence as to who they are or were. Mr. Bryan takes the safe course of declaring that the gold standard is a conspiracy in and of itself—a proposition that is outside the field of logic, either to prove or disprove. Senator Stewart of Nevada drivels about "the crime of 1873," meaning an act of Congress for which he and nearly every one else voted, and which merely recognized the fact that silver dollars had formed no part of our currency for many years. But neither Senator Stewart nor any of that ilk names the criminals engaged in this act, or proposes to punish them for their misdeeds. What he and they all agree upon is that the crime itself must be punished in the name of justice, and they propose to inflict punishment upon millions of their fellow-citizens who can by no possible perversion of facts be shown to have participated in any conspiracy of crime whatever. Their zeal is only surpassed by that of Philip II. of Spain, whose enthusiasm for religion was so consuming that in an access of fervor he sentenced the entire population of the Low Countries to death on account of the existence of heresy among them.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This extraordinary theory of justice has been explicitly maintained by Mr. Bryan. In his celebrated speech at the Chicago convention he declared that "we, the people," could change the monetary system without protecting those who had loaned money before the change was made. Creditors were entitled to no protection now, because the act of 1873 did not protect debtors. It is not important for our present contention to remark that this proposition is false. Mr. Bryan knows as well as any one that when the law of 1873 was passed, the gold dollar was cheaper than the silver dollar, and that the act was in so far a "protection" of debtors and not of creditors. He knows perfectly well that the internal business of the country was then done on a paper-money basis, and that the laws making irredeemable paper legal tender for debts were laws for the "protection" of debtors to an enormous extent. He knows that not one contract in ten million in 1873 was payable in silver, and that every contract payable in dollars was payable in depreciated paper money. He knows that it was five years after 1873 before contracts to pay dollars came to mean payment in gold or its equivalent, and that not one contract in a thousand of those in existence in 1879 had been in existence in 1873. He knows that the debts of 1873 have long since been extinguished, that the debtors and creditors of that day are for the most part dead, or have closed their business lives. He knows that the debts that are now existing have been contracted with full knowledge that the money borrowed was as good as gold, and was to be repaid in money as good as was borrowed. He knows that creditors have accepted lower and lower rates of interest, and that debtors with a reputation for honesty could borrow on terms so favorable as to more than counterbalance any real or fancied appreciation of gold. He has sat in Congress and has heard all these truths fully and clearly presented, and he now goes about the country proclaiming what he knows to be false.

All this, however, is beside the point that we set ourselves to discuss. That point is the conception of justice as requiring the infliction of suffering on the innocent because, some time in the past, a measure of legislation did not "protect" debtors. We may grant that the act of 1873 was a blunder or a crime; that it was passed by a conspiracy of bankers; that it was fraudulent in its conception and corrupt in its consummation; but how does that affect the question of the justice of free coinage now and to-day? If any perpetrators of the crime were known, they might have been punished. But none were known. If any sufferers from the crime had claims to present, they could have been indemnified. No claims were presented. Debtors and creditors affected by the act, if any were affected, have long since squared their accounts. If silver were now coined freely, no one that profited by its former demonetization would be injured, none that was injured would be profited. Those whose mortgages were foreclosed would not get their lands back again; those who foreclosed the mortgages would keep their gains. It is the men and women who are now active and who are to be active in the coming years that would be affected; and yet their rights are to be sacrificed for the sake of taking vengeance on an abstraction—of executing justice, not on criminals, for they are not to be found, but upon the "plain people" who are so unfortunate as to live under a government which enacted an obnoxious law in the time of their fathers. Whether we may reverently conceive the Almighty as visiting the sins of the fathers upon their children we need not here ask; but we have no disposition to allow the members of the Chicago convention and its nominee to exact this form of vicarious sacrifice. Mr. Bryan is fond of referring to that great and stirring epoch when our forefathers asserted their independence. Do the American people need to be reminded that independence was demanded because of ex-post-facto laws, and that the theory of ex-post-facto justice was denounced and repudiated by the great statesmen of the Revolution in the Constitution which they framed for the protection of coming generations against the wicked schemes of future demagogues?

A STRIKING ILLUSTRATION.

WHAT might happen here during a "craze," supposing we had no constitution and were completely at the mercy of a Croker or Platt or Bryan legislature, has, happily for the whole world, been abundantly made manifest in Australia during the last seven years, where unchecked Bryanism has been rampant. The "workingman's party" has there been in complete possession of the Government, without other restraint than the Queen's veto, which is rarely used about internal affairs. It is not possible to go over the whole ground at once, but we may recur to the subject. M. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu has made a study of the matter during a residence in Australasia, and has published the result in an interesting article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Confining ourselves to what he says about New Zealand, we find his account of the land tenure most instructive. The Government of New Zealand has taken possession of the land on the Henry George plan, and for the most part let it out on various terms and conditions to the occupants, though it sells to some extent. This right to sell in fee simple is seriously modified by an act, passed in 1894, which gives the State a right to buy anybody out who has more than 200 acres of arable land, 400 acres of half arable, half pasture land, or 1,000 acres of pasture, for a price to be fixed by a special commission, if the owner does not accept what the State offers him. The object of this is, of course, to increase the number of small holdings.

To do this more effectively the plan of "Village Settlements" was devised in 1893. Each "Settlement" or association has to contain at least twenty persons, to which the Government allots about 130 acres, and advances $250 for each member, to be repaid in instalments, with interest at 5 per cent., within ten years. The Settlement is governed by a Board of Trustees, and each individual is to have as much and what land is assigned to him by this board, and can acquire none other. Any one, male or female, except an Asiatic, can become a member, but as a rule women have not been admitted. The Board is supreme in the matter of admission and expulsion, and may expel for "insubordination," "disobedience to the rules," or "absence without leave." An expelled person can appeal to the "General Assembly," which decides by simple majority. In case of expulsion, resignation, or death, the owner's property reverts to the association, so that he cannot make a will, but the trustees may, in their discretion, provide for his widow or family.

The powers of these trustees are settled in twenty articles. They conduct the relations of the Settlement with the Government; they direct the cultivation of the land and the erection of buildings. They decide what industries shall be established, and pass on all purchases and distributions made for the community, and decide what is necessary for the maintenance of the members. They direct and superintend the labor of the members and fix the length of the day's work. They distribute coupons in exchange for produce brought to the magazines. They watch over the public health and the maintenance of good order and discipline. They can fine to the amount of $50, and can increase a member's hours of labor, or cut down his allowance at the store, as punishment for breach of the rules. They appoint and dismiss all officers and fix their salaries. The Settler is bound to be obedient and respectful to the trustees, and to reside on the land allotted to him except when away on leave of absence; but he is entitled to a fortnight of vacation each year. He must undertake no labor outside, and neither buy nor sell without the permission of the trustees. He owns his furniture, clothes, and cooking utensils, but all tools or instruments of production belong to the association. The Villages were, it will be seen, a sort of slavery, of the semi-military kind, which all socialistic organizations must be.

Well, how did the plan succeed? A parliamentary inquiry instituted in 1895 told the whole story. Of thirteen Settlements that were started, all but one had in eighteen months exhausted their allow-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance from the state and were clamoring for more. They were also heavily in debt; the most heavily indebted owed $650 per head. All except three said they could not go on without more advances from the state. In some, land had remained uncultivated, because the members could not agree as to the crop to be planted. A great variety of unsuccessful experiments had been made to "placate" cliques or individuals. The standard of living fixed by the Board was very low. The day's work—seven hours and a half—was too short for farming. The women were not admitted to deliberations. One village had four presidents in fifteen months. A trustee rarely served out his term, owing to little risings against him on account of unpopularity. Fights and riots were frequent and unpunished. A trustee who was "pounded" while at work in the field said he could not get redress, because it was a trustee who had done it and all the other trustees were on his side, and he believed they might commit murder with impunity. He also testified that a Settler having been assaulted, and one of his limbs broken, the trustees decreed his expulsion, but the General Assembly, on being appealed to, refused to sanction it. In another village, thefts were numerous, and thieves were arrested but not punished. One witness declared that when he joined he was a great supporter of "land for the people"; but, after what he had seen, he was in favor of "land for himself." The government was, in fact, very much what the government of Tammany would be if it had unchecked sway anywhere. They are still trying these experiments in Australia, and the way they propose to remedy the decided failures is, as might be expected, to increase the advances from the state. In fact, if one wants to see Populism, Bryanism, Tillmanism, Crokerism, and Plattism in full sway, one ought to go to Australia.

The cause of this wretched blundering is plain enough. All successful governments, if they are not to depend on pure force—that is, to be simple slavery—must be founded on principles of human nature and on human experience. That is, in establishing them we have to consider what man as we know him, men like ourselves, are likely to do under such and such conditions, and to read what man has done under such and such other conditions. We have, in short, to examine our own hearts and read history. But Popocrats and Bryanites refuse to do anything of the kind. What they insist on is, that when a few long-haired men tell us they "know," or "contend," or "feel," or "believe," or "predict" something, we are to take their word for Gospel, and upset everything which the race in ten thousand years has hit upon and practised as most conducive to its happiness.

ENGLAND: THE GOVERNMENT AND THE SESSION.

LONDON, August 24, 1896.

THE history of the session which has just closed has been surprising and instructive, and may have some interest for American readers even in the midst of their far more exciting struggles. At its beginning everything augured well for the Government. They were supported by a majority in the House of Commons far larger than any since 1833, a majority of 152. They had a cabinet no doubt inconveniently large, but one which contained such able and experienced administrators as Lord Salisbury, the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Goschen, and Sir M. Hicks-Beach, and two effective debaters in Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Arthur Balfour. They had not only a small British Opposition to confront them, but an Irish Opposition divided into three mutually hostile factions—an advantage of immense value. The country was not anxious for much legislation, having been rather alarmed by the number and gravity of the measures which the preceding ministry had put forward, and would have been well content had the new Government given it a prudent and business-like administration of foreign and domestic affairs. The session, however, has proved a disappointing one to the dominant party; and the Government emerge from it seriously discredited, if not substantially weakened. They have been forced to drop their principal measure, the Education bill. They have carried only two measures of magnitude, the Agricultural Rating bill, which has disgusted many of their supporters in the boroughs, who look on it as a plundering of the urban taxpayer for the benefit of the rural ratepayers (*rate* is the term used in England for a local tax), and the Irish Land bill, which has offended many among the landlord party, without satisfying the Tory tenant farmers in the north of Ireland. Many of the other promises made in the Queen's speech and still more of the promises made at the last general election remain unfulfilled. Some of those promises need not have ever been made, but, having been made, the failure to deal with them gives rise to much hostile comment. Thus this strong Government, with its large majority, has accomplished comparatively little, and has not only exposed itself to the taunts of its adversaries, but incurred the scarcely concealed distrust of its friends.

What have the causes of this failure been? Three may be selected as the most important. For one of these, the largeness of their majority, they are in no way to blame. But a majority of 152, though it was received with exultation, is anything but a blessing. It makes the leaders over-confident and even reckless. They think they can carry anything, and become less cautious in their strategy. It also impairs party discipline. Although the Tory party is naturally very obedient and cohesive, some of its members are much more apt to show independence and attack the measures of their chiefs when they feel they can do so without the danger of turning the chiefs out of office. The Government have never been in any risk of losing a division, and have usually obtained nearly their full numbers, but there has been a good deal of criticism of them in debate from their own side, and a good deal of discontent which might have failed to find expression had the majority, because smaller, been more in awe of the Opposition.

The second cause was their carelessness in the conduct of business in the House of Commons. To arrange that business, and keep pushing it steadily through, selecting the most important bills and pressing each in its proper order, while keeping the House as a whole in good humor by not requiring too many late sittings, is a task of some difficulty. It does not require brilliant talents. The late Mr. W. H. Smith, who was so far from being a brilliant man that he could not even make a passably well turned speech, discharged it successfully, for he brought to it plenty of tact, strong common sense, and unsparing diligence. The Ministry, however, showed no diligence at all, and often seemed to let the business of the House drift. Mr. Arthur Balfour, who was leader, was frequently absent during debates, and seemed to take his duties as leader much too easily. Mr. Chamberlain, who is nothing if not a practical parliamentarian, absented himself so frequently that people began to suppose some motive for his absence. This want of assiduity on the part of the leaders was not redeemed by their lieutenants. Thus the business of the House got into confusion, much valuable time was lost, and bills that might have been carried had to be abandoned. Mr. Balfour is very popular with his own side, and is well liked personally by the Opposition. His methods of leading have, however, been the object of many strictures from friends as well as opponents. Even the *Times*, usually the Government's warmest advocate, attacked him. Were it not for his personal popularity and the distrust felt in some sections of the Tory party for Mr. Chamberlain, his position as leader might have been threatened. That it is really threatened few competent observers believe, though all agree that more care must be shown next session.

The third chief cause of the discredit the Ministry have incurred is the want of judgment they showed in framing the Education bill, which was the principal measure of the session, and the one which roused by far the keenest feelings. People had expected it to be a comparatively small affair, mainly designed to provide additional grants for those denominational schools, nearly all of them belonging to the Church of England or the Roman Catholics, which are called voluntary schools because they are supported, not by the local taxes, but by the subscriptions of the denomination, which, however, now represent a smaller sum than the grant which they receive from the central public treasury. But it proved to be a large measure, which raised three sets of questions, each of which in England, as in most countries, excites warm interest—questions of finance, questions of local government, questions of religious teaching. A bill handling any one of these, and still more a bill handling all three at once, was sure to raise opposition and be subjected to the closest scrutiny. The financial provisions provoked a controversy between two sets of supporters of the bill—those who wished the denominational schools to be subsidized (as now, but more largely) from the central treasury, and those who wished them to receive a share of local taxation. The provisions regarding local government menaced the authority, or even the existence, of the School Boards in many parts of the country, and the friends of the School Boards were up in arms. The proposals which affected religious teaching raised a still more serious storm. The Protestant Nonconformists, or at least all their most active and influential leaders, looked on these proposals as an attack

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on religious freedom and a breach of the compromise arrived at in 1870; and though most of the Nonconformists, being Liberals, would in any case have been unlikely to favor the bill, that section of Nonconformists which had left the Liberal party on the home-rule question, and had supported the Tories at the last election, were also alarmed, and began to threaten a revolt if this part of the bill were persevered with.

Nor, indeed, was the religious disquiet entirely confined to the dissenting bodies. Within the Church of England itself the section which holds doctrines approaching or sometimes scarcely differing from those held by the Roman Catholic Church, has of late years made great progress. Its leaders, both ecclesiastical and lay, are energetic and untiring. They attach, like the Church of Rome, immense importance to the control of elementary education and to the power of teaching dogma in their own way and by teachers whom they have selected. They are therefore, as a rule, warmly opposed to the schools under the control of the School Boards, and eager to promote denominational schools in which strictly denominational instruction may be given. Their zeal in this cause has excited some suspicion and even alarm among the general mass of the Church of England laity, who are still very far from being Anglo-Catholics; and this suspicion extended itself to the Education bill, leading not a few old-fashioned Conservatives to regard it with a distrust none the less real for being sparingly and obscurely expressed. Thus the bill had enemies among the friends as well as the opponents of the Government. Its troubled life and its early death were due far more to the many currents of hostility which thus converged upon it than to the lateness of the period at which its consideration in committee began. That so experienced a cabinet could have erred so gravely excites no great surprise. Lord Salisbury knows but little of public opinion and the temper of the House of Commons; constructive legislation has never been Mr. Balfour's strong point; and Mr. Chamberlain's judgment is not thought to be a sound one. It was supposed that the Duke of Devonshire, who has plenty of shrewdness and knows the House of Commons, would have warned his colleagues; but he is apt to take things easily, and may have acquiesced against his own forecasts.

Although the collapse of their principal measure has tarnished the reputation of the Government, or, as the man in the street says, "has rubbed the gilt off the gingerbread," it must not be supposed that their political position is seriously shaken, and that either they or the present Parliament are likely to come to a speedy end. Even more serious blunders in parliamentary management and schemes of legislation may be committed by a party which has only just come into power, and whose majority in the House of Commons desires nothing so little as a dissolution. If the country at large were very keenly interested in politics, a reaction might no doubt set in which would shake the fidelity of a considerable part of that majority. But the country is apathetic. Not for many years past have political questions moved so small a part of the electors, and moved them so languidly. The newspapers report debates in Parliament far more briefly than they did formerly; and if one were to judge by the sale of the newspapers, especially the evening papers, all kinds of amusement, especially athletics and the other forms of sport, fill the mind of the average man much more than political questions do. There is small likelihood that any one of the domestic questions now pending will dispel this singular apathy, which is evidently due quite as much to causes outside the sphere of politics as to the present position of English parties. A crisis in foreign affairs, however, might change everything in a moment; and no one can say that a crisis in foreign affairs is impossible, for the state of the East is disquieting, and other matters pending between the Great Powers contain elements of trouble. But this is a subject too large to be dealt with now. Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, and the causes that have so greatly lowered the prestige which for a time he enjoyed as a foreign minister, deserve a letter to themselves.

C. E.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF PSYCHOLOGY.

GENEVA, August 20, 1896.

THE third Congress was held at Munich, August 4 to 9, under the presidency of Prof. Stumpf of Berlin. It was the largest and in many respects the most successful of the three. Of course the German attendance was fuller than at the last one, held in London in 1892, and German delegates are always most welcome. When we take into account the fact that Germany is to-day the country where psychology is most vigorously and successfully pursued, it follows that this Congress is, up to date, the greatest gathering of eminent psychologists ever seen. As to France, the attendance was disappointing in numbers, although the delegation was very representative; and the same is true of the British contingent. The other countries, except America, were adequately represented; the small attendance from our side of the water being a matter of the more surprise in view of the tendency of our professors to take their vacation abroad—indeed, the attendance at the last Congress in London was considerably larger.

In its general character the Congress tends to recall the remarks which I made in this journal four years ago on the London meeting. The tendency to allow the popular attendance upon the meetings to swamp the scientific proceedings was more marked in Munich, and it is not too much to say that this constituted a very great defect in the arrangements. The membership was over four hundred. There was a constant flow from hall to hall, and the corridors were filled with bewildered persons. Some limit must be put on the popular membership at the next congress, or the scientific people will yield the field to the sightseers and amateurs. The other possible improvement which I suggested in the earlier letter also comes to the front again apropos of this meeting in Munich—the crowded condition of the programme. Besides the general meetings, which came in the forenoon sessions, the committee arranged for five sections all running simultaneously, and all subject to constant give and take, as respects their audiences, from one to another. Besides the constant interruptions and great confusion which this produced, it practically prevented a person from hearing any readers whom he especially desired to hear. Since the time limits were not enforced upon the papers or discussions, one could never tell how far on this section or that had progressed, and so could not time his presence for any particular reader. Moreover, the papers were as usual so generally accepted by the committee—any one who wanted to present something had only to send his name and topic beforehand—that many were read which were of little or no scientific value; and the titles of papers were entered on the programme in advance, so that there was no way to learn infallibly whether a particular reader had arrived and would present his dissertation or not. The gaps left by the absentees were consequently quite an unknown quantity. Every such meeting should have a committee to read and select from available papers, arrange them strictly according to unchangeable time-divisions, and require each reader to report finally a day or two before the meeting as to his actual attendance, the final programme being only then printed. This would have the further advantage of ruling out titles and names which are from the first doubtful; for it is astonishing to what an extent men fail to carry out what should be their serious intention when they give their names to be printed on these Congress programmes.

So much for the general character of the Congress. Of course, this is not the place for an account, in any detail, of its scientific features. The division into sections will show something of the remarkable range that modern psychology finds itself obliged to take: "Normal," "Sleep and Hypnotism," "Mental Pathology," "Neurology," "The Senses and Psychophysics"—the titles being somewhat abbreviated in this list. In each of the sections there were some great papers and one or more lively discussions. The most interesting thing in the way of neurological work—it was presented, however, in one of the general meetings—was the paper by the veteran Flechsig on "Association Centres." It will be remembered that Prof. Flechsig has been engaged for some time on comparative studies of the brains of human infants at different ages, attempting so to arrive at a view of the order of development of the elementary mental functions, with the corresponding progress in brain anatomy and physiology. He has published very rich results from time to time, and among them is his determination of certain so-called "association centres." He thinks that the much discussed frontal region of the brain is the location of associations of a higher and more abstract kind; and that in the region back of the well-known "motor region," extending to the visual centre in the occipital region, is a great centre for the associations which bind the sense functions together. This in brief, and without the discriminations which an accurate account of his views should make. The reason which he gives for these determinations is that only after some growth, and after the senses are well developed, do we find the great masses of connecting fibres which traverse these regions forming in the child's brain. Apart from the question of fact, as to which Prof. Flechsig's researches may be considered as being of the greatest importance (especially when we consider his method), it is difficult to see how these regions can be, in any true sense, "association centres"; for, admitting that the connections between the sense centres run through these regions, the main thing about the associations must be the things associated, not the mere fact of connections between them. One would hardly call the bunch of telegraph wires on the house-top a "communication centre"; the loci of communication are still at the telegraph offices. Without them, the wires would be possibly even more helpless than the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offices without the wires. Prof. Flechsig's paper was a model for imitation in the manner of its presentation, and its interest was enhanced by slides showing the infant's brain, in sections illustrating the periods of its growth.

Another contribution to the understanding of the relation of Psychology and Brain Physiology was that of the well known neurologist, Prof. Edinger of Frankfort, on the question, "Can Psychology make use of the results so far attained in Brain Anatomy?" He did not confine himself to anatomy, but presented a series of interesting notices on the development of the nervous system in the scale of life, and made a strong plea for a corresponding genetic study of comparative psychology. Genetic psychology, he says, is so far behind analytic psychology because psychologists have confined their attention, on the anatomical side, to the cerebral hemispheres, while what they should do is to study the evolution of the nervous system all the way up, and see the progress of consciousness with it. "Gerade auf diesem Gebiete müssen anatomisch-physiologische und psychologische Studien durchaus Hand in Hand gehen." All this is true and remarkably opportune, I think, despite the fact that in his main illustration Prof. Edinger falls into one of the glaring fallacies into which this sort of analogy between body and mind may lead. He says there are certain creatures (fishes) which have no hemispheres, and it follows that, on the psychological side, we must deny to these creatures "all that the hemispheres are necessary for in the higher creatures." This overlooks the great principle that, in the lower forms, less differentiated structures may do what more differentiated ones do in the higher forms. To press this point consistently, he would seem to have to deny consciousness altogether to these fishes. The lesson of this paper, however, is a most timely one; psychologists, especially in Germany, are not half awake to the genetic problem, and when they do awake, no doubt it is true that the richest lessons that the physiology of the nervous system will have to teach them, will be derived from such comparative study as Prof. Edinger advises.

Several papers of general interest were read in the open meetings. The President's address was rather more severe and *wissenschaftlich* than the earlier addresses of the presiding officers have been, but it was an exceedingly interesting and discriminating review of theories on the connection of mind and body. The arraignment of Parallelism was very effective—possibly more so than the positive doctrine of the paper. Prof. Ebbinghaus of Breslau gave a new way of testing the mental condition of school-children at different periods and in different conditions of fatigue, etc. It differs from the methods already in vogue in that it endeavors to test the child's correlating or apperceptive faculty rather than his sense-perceptions or his memory. The method, which teachers will find extremely interesting, consists in taking a passage from some interesting narrative-text, and, after striking out various words and phrases and printing the passage with blank spaces where these erasures have been made, telling the child to fill in the spaces as he thinks the sense requires. This requirement certainly calls upon the child for more than memory, and the results of its application, as reported by Prof. Ebbinghaus, seem to show its superiority; but it would appear to be applicable to children of a more advanced age, after the memory tests are outgrown. This general judgment, however, I must make with reservation, since the synopsis of the paper did not reach my hands. This may suffice to indicate the scope of the method, and to call the attention of our educational authorities to it. They will also be interested in Prof. Ebbinghaus's severe criticism of what he called the "American method" of testing the mental condition of school-children by the memory tests.

The fact that the papers on "Hypnotism" were less than in earlier congresses, in proportion to the entire number, and that there were a bare half-dozen on thought-transference and telepathy, shows the general tendency of psychology. The hypnotic period is past, even in France. Not that the gain from the study of hypnotism has not been permanent and great; on the contrary, its results are only now getting so absorbed into the body of psychological truth that it no longer makes sensational appeals for a hearing. As to telepathy, I think there is a real decay of interest in the subject, much as this is to be deplored. The most interesting paper in the hypnotic field was a general one by Prof. Pierre Janet.

The section on the Senses and Psychophysics did much exact work. Dr. Stratton of the University of California communicated some valuable experiments of his on the artificial reinverting of the retinal image and its effects on the sense of bodily position in space, which will be of especial interest to those who think the normal inversion of the image requires a theory.

Two other general questions of great interest were discussed, with as much ability as vehemence, by the Vice-President of the Congress, Prof. Lipps of Munich. One of his papers was a very important contribution in the sadly neglected field of the æsthetics of visual form. I can do no more than recommend his paper in the Congress "Proceedings" (to appear very soon) to those who are concerned with elementary æsthetic principles. The other topic was the much-discussed one on the "Unconscious" in psychology. The question, Can mental states be unconscious? has a peculiar fascination, because of the great number of verbal distinctions of which it admits. It must be confessed that Prof. Lipps's paper did not make the number of these verbal distinctions less. He reaches a sort of return to the soul-substance theory—a hidden thing in which mental states, and especially tendencies of an active kind, may be preserved when we are not conscious of them. This has long ago been refuted as a general conception, I think; but the main point of interest, and that for which I bring the matter up, is, that the results of pathology, dual consciousness, "multiple personality," etc., which are considered by many as giving the strongest evidence for the "unconscious," require quite a different theory. The "unconscious" of the pathologists is a body of conscious data gathered into a new and secondary consciousness of its own. While these states of mind are not conscious to the major person—and so, by a certain license, are called "unconscious"—still it is just the evidence that they are conscious in their own way and in their own seat in the nervous system that enables us to say that they are mental. So all this evidence goes, after all, to show a correspondence between the mental and the conscious. This Prof. Lipps does not seem to see, and his treatment of the question, from a purely verbal and analytic point of view, was consequently very inadequate.

In the higher fields of Ethics and Anthropology there were interesting papers, of which my space allows the mention of only one, on "Ethical Values," by Prof. Ehrenfels (just called from Vienna to Prague), and one on the "Category of Individuality in Savage Thought," by Mr. Stout, the editor of *Mind*. Mr. Stout, I may add, has just been called to a lectureship in Comparative Psychology in the University of Aberdeen—a novelty for the British Isles, but appropriate in the institution which Prof. Bain has made famous in connection with psychological study. The next Congress is to meet in Paris in 1900 in connection with the Universal Exposition. Prof. Ribot will be President, M. Ch. Richet Vice-President, and M. Pierre Janet Secretary. The International Committee for the Paris meeting has the following American representation: Profs. James (Harvard), Titchener (Cornell), Hall (Clark), and Baldwin (Princeton). I cannot close this letter without referring — with profound regret, which many other American students of philosophy must also feel—to the death of Prof. Avenarius of Zurich on August 18. Where I now write, the feeling that one of the greatest philosophical thinkers of Europe no longer adorns a Swiss University is very acute; and those who know the work of Prof. Avenarius must feel it also, regardless of the place of their habitation.

J. M. B.

THE ABBÉ PRÉVOST.—II.

PARIS, August 28, 1896.

IT would be a curious study to analyze the first essays of journalism in France. We have found in *Le Pour et le Contre* of the Abbé Prévost one of the first embryos of that dangerous instrument which has become the fourth power in the State. These early irregular, transient mediums of publicity were not yet political instruments. Such papers as *Le Pour et le Contre* were obliged to content themselves with literary and social matters. Still, they already had their importance; we see Voltaire writing to his friend Thiériot on July 24, 1733: "Please thank for me the author of *Le Pour et le Contre* for his eulogy. I am very pleased to have my vanity flattered by one who has so often touched my sensibility by his works. Such a man was well made for experiencing every emotion." The eulogy of which Voltaire here speaks was written on the occasion of the 'Lettres sur les Anglais.' In another letter, to the same correspondent, Voltaire sends a message to the "tender and passionate author of 'Manon Lescaut.'"

At the end of 1733, when 'Cleveland' and 'Manon Lescaut' had been universally read by the reading public of the time, Prévost addressed a letter to the Pope, asking for his pardon; the year after, Clement XII. granted him the remission of his error and gave him an induct of transference to the ancient *observance de Saint-Benoît ad benevolum receptorem*. The Council of Trent forbade all regular monks to change their congregation so as to enter a less severe order. The Benedictines of Saint-Maur, to whom Prévost belonged, did not appeal against the Pope's indulgence. Prévost had to make a second, short novitiate, after which he was matriculed at the Abbey of Le Grénatière, in Vendée. There is no trace of his having lived there. We find Prévost back in Paris, continuing *Le Pour et le Contre*, living in the society of Mme. de Tencin, of the Duke of Kingston, of Piron; he is still obliged, however, to spend some time in an abbey of his order. He writes in English from this abbey to his friend

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thiériot (November, 1735): "Cleveland and that dear Fanny are not out of my mind, but a great many friends of mine, on whose counsels and wisdom I rely, have advised me to publish no love-works till my retreat is over. . . . I am condemned to live here till the 10th of December, for no solicitation could prevail with the Pope to lessen my spiritual punishment." We need not be surprised if he wrote in English to his friend Thiériot, though Thiériot was a Frenchman, as we find in the same letter phrases like this: "No compliments for your Psyché, since you think it so dangerous for my repose. I won't see her more neither, till I have got a hundred thousand a year. Then I can love, and tell it and hope to be well received." Prévost clearly had no vocation for a conventual life. The salon of Mme. de Tencin was more congenial to him than a monastery.

We do not know by what influence he became, after his new novitiate, an almoner in the household of the Prince de Conti; he was thus regularly dispensed from the obligation to live in a convent. Louis François de Bourbon was a profligate prince. "With a revenue which was augmented by five hundred livres annually," says D'Argenson, "his domestics were not paid, people died of hunger in his house and had no fire in winter." Prévost received no salary, and his functions were purely honorary. La Harpe writes in his literary correspondence: "The late Prince de Conti was not fastidious on the subject of the mass. He wished to have for his almoner the Abbé Prévost, the novel-writer. 'Monseigneur,' said the Abbé to him, 'I have never said mass.' 'Never mind,' says the Prince, 'I never hear it.'" Prévost, meanwhile, continued to write in *Le Pour et le Contre*, wrote the 'Dean of Killerine,' and translated the "Conscious Lovers," a comedy of Steele's (this translation appeared in *Le Pour et le Contre*). We find in that journal a curious critical theory of Prévost's. He maintained that "a language which needs as puerile a help as rhyme in order to be suitable to poetry betrays accordingly its imperfection and its weakness." He proposed to abolish rhyme and thus "to render a great service to the French Parnassus." These articles were written on occasion of some English epigrams.

In 1739, the Abbé Prévost left *Le Pour et le Contre*. His father had died, leaving some little fortune; but, having taken the vow of poverty, he could not inherit. His affairs were so deranged that he thought for a moment of returning to London. He offered to Voltaire to write a 'Defence of M. de Voltaire and of his Works,' an offer which Voltaire politely refused. "You wish, sir, to make my apologia. . . . The only reason which hinders me from accepting is the same reason which prevented the great Condé from writing his memoirs. (You see that I do not choose mediocre examples.) He said that he could not justify himself without attacking too many people." Voltaire offered his services to Prévost with Frederick the Great, a famous patron of literature. Prévost answered him that before leaving for Prussia, he had first to pay his debts, something like four or five thousand francs. He left France, however, in 1741, for a little time; his exile was caused by some sort of collaboration with an abbé who published a paper, a *gazette* (it was the word of the period, which is still retained by the old *Gazette de France*), containing the petty daily news of the capital. He spent the term of this exile in Brussels, in Frankfort; he was allowed to come back to Paris in 1742, and began a translation of Richardson's 'Pamela' (the first edition of 'Pamela' in English was published in London in 1741-42). I will say at once that he translated 'Clarissa Harlowe' in 1751 under the title of 'Lettres Anglaises, ou Histoire de Miss Clarisse Harlowe.' It is curious to have Voltaire's opinion of Richardson: "It is cruel for a man as lively as I am to read nine volumes without finding anything in it. . . . 'Clarissa' and 'Pamela' have succeeded because they excite the curiosity of the reader by a chaos of inutilities." The Abbé Raynal writes: "The Abbé Prévost has just translated in France a manuscript entitled 'Lettres Anglaises.' This long work makes more noise in Paris than it has had success. . . . I have experienced in reading this book something extraordinary, the liveliest pleasure and the most crushing tedium." Faithful to Richardson, the Abbé Prévost published in 1754 a translation of 'Sir Charles Grandison.' He probably maintained personal relations with Richardson, as he announced his translation in 1753, and the original English edition appeared only in 1754; it is true that another translation appeared in Göttingen before Prévost's, which appeared in Amsterdam. Prévost worked at the same time at translating Middleton's Life of Cicero, and Cicero's Familiar Letters, and (in his 'Histoire Générale des Voyages') John Green's 'New General Collection of Voyages and Travels,' published in London in numbers from 1745 to 1747.

Prévost spent a part of a year at Chantilly—it would be more exact to say at Saint-Firmin, a small village near Chantilly (where the Duke de Chartres often lives now, in a house situated on the Grand Canal in the park which surrounds the château). In a small pamphlet, written in 1762, 'The Triumph of Chantilly, or Letter of M. Quin to M . . . on the fêtes given there three months ago,' we read that

"M. l'Abbé Prévost, who spends a part of the year in this Canton, attached to it by the beauty and retirement of the place, by the plan of his studies (he is at present engaged upon the History of the House of Condé and of Conti), and probably even more by the marked proofs of kindness with which he is honored by his Serene Highness, is asked to compliment the Prince on his arrival; he accepts with alacrity this honorable invitation. . . . We awaited the orator. He was not visible. In a few moments he appears, out of breath. His residence being at some distance from the château, he had been deceived by the rapidity of the Prince."

The Prince de Condé asked him to leave him in writing his compliments, which he was not able to sing. Prévost evidently himself wrote this part of the relation: "Here the old orator, who once on a time liked to sing, would have gayly sung two or three couplets of his invention—that is to say, very bad, as nature had not made him a poet." It is not necessary to cite these verses, which Prévost himself judged very mediocre. We have also a letter written from Saint-Firmin on the 18th of December, to one of his relations. As for the history of the House of Condé, it is possible that Prévost may have collected some documents on the subject, but there is no trace of them in the archives of the House of Condé. Prévost had so many irons in the fire, he was so occupied with his novels, his translations from English authors were so incessant, that he must have had very little time left for the work he had undertaken, at the request of Quin, superintendent of the Gardens of Chantilly. In 1760 he published a translation of Hume's History; he translated, at the same period, the 'Memoirs of Miss Sidney Biddulph,' written in three volumes by Frances Sheridan, mother of the celebrated Richard Brinsley Sheridan. M. Harrisse gives us an account of all the literary work of Prévost, showing a total of 112 volumes, 65 of which were original writings, and 47 translations. His last work has for its title 'Letters to a Young Lord, translated from the English by the Abbé Prévost,' and, curiously enough, the work is not a translation, it is original; but English books were the fashion, and Prévost had more than anybody contributed to it. Grimm was taken in, and writes in his correspondence about "the original of this book, which had much success in England, while in France nobody looked at the translation."

During the latter part of his life, the Abbé Prévost resided constantly at Saint-Firmin, in a house which belonged to the widow of a lawyer. We read in the *Nouvelles à la main* that "on the 1st of December, 1763, the Abbé Prévost, very well known in the republic of letters by the works which he has issued, was found dead in the park of Chantilly from the effects of an attack of apoplexy which overtook him while out walking." M. Harrisse has taken the pains to examine and to compare the various accounts given at the time of the death of Prévost, and he comes to the conclusion that Prévost did not die of apoplexy, but from the rupture of an aneurism, not on the 1st of December, but on the 25th of November. He proves, also, that Prévost, at the time of his death, was not, as has been sometimes said, in a state bordering on poverty; he was in possession of a priory, which yielded him more than 2,000 livres annually, he had been able to procure a nice country-house, he was surrounded with friends. Nor did he die out of the pale of the church; the Benedictines claimed him as still belonging to their order, and buried him under the pavement of one of their churches. In the priory of Saint-Nicolas d'Acy there could be read before the Revolution this epitaph:

Hic jacet D. Antonius Prévost
Sacerdos majoris ordin. S. Benedicti
Monachus professus quum plurimis
Voluminibus in lucem editis ingnitus
Obiit 25. Novembris 1763.

Correspondence.

EDUCATE THE YOUTH BETIMES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Whatever may be the outcome in November of the present political contest, it is plain to one who for twenty-seven years as a merchant has had ample opportunities of observation in four States adjacent to Ohio, that the present controversy has aroused in the minds (or rather in the hearts) of a large portion of our people sentiments on various topics that will not be laid to rest with the termination of this struggle. Never before in any question of great public moment has the phantom of the French Revolution stalked abroad in the land as to-day. Not alone in the great cities is this spirit manifest, but it has permeated all strata of our people. The towns and the villages teem with evidence of the malignant envy and hatred felt by the man who has nothing for him who has something. Our system of general if not universal education, which has been held as the sufficient safeguard in a free country against the possibility of such conditions, seems not to have justified the hopes of its advocates.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our schools have taught their pupils to be "smart," but the average voter, especially of the younger generation, has no understanding of obedience to authority or veneration for law or established rights and conditions. With "book learning" enough to be "sharp," respect for or submission to anything not to his whim is an unknown tenet in his limited category of virtues.

The present discussion of the money question, and the tendencies developed by it, reveal to the most casual onlooker a density of ignorance among our people as distressing and appalling as it is dangerous. The people of the Eastern States have scant appreciation of the volcanic situation on their western borders. The demagogue and political charlatan never found fairer field for his efforts on the stump than among the discontented masses who form his applauding audiences. If the country is to be conserved in its integrity to future generations, it must devolve upon those who have the brains and the means to guide its destinies, to stop long enough in the mad pursuit of wealth to build on surer foundations, or their castles of gold will be found to rest but on shifting sands.

The present free-silver movement is no more than a grand rally of all the malcontents of the land. One has but to look at the banners of the Bryan cohorts to see whence his retainers are recruited. And if dispersed in November, they will gather again, in the near future, to war for destruction and spoliation. It is not possible to educate the people of a country like ours on any economic question in the brief period of a ninety-day campaign. "In time of peace prepare for war," and the work can begin none too soon.

The past ten years of utter disregard for every sound principle in the management of national, State, and municipal finances, and the flagrant and criminally reckless methods of corporate and individual business, are not understood or seen or realized even by those who have been the heaviest direct sufferers. Not the lack of money, but the unwise readiness to extend credit and incur indebtedness, has brought us to the present conditions of financial unrest, where repudiation of honest obligations is made the battle-cry of a revolutionary wing of one of the great national parties. To combat all this in the future should be the ambition of every lover of his country. The schoolboy of to-day is taught nothing of the certain difficulty and probable danger of incurring debt, nothing of the sacredness of a money obligation. It is not surprising that he should grow to business manhood with perverted financial instincts. The ability to borrow is to him the acme of business shrewdness, the astuteness to defeat his creditors and evade legal punishment is too often the sum of his financial morality. The example of success in others, attained by devious methods, stimulates his perverse ambition, while it engenders in all classes a contempt and disregard for all property rights, be they founded in justice or in iniquity, and the whole social structure is shaken. The present anarchistic silverite campaign is sowing deep in fertile soil the seeds of future trouble. Surely, unless those to whom much has been given and of whom much will be required, awake to the higher duties of citizenship, the outbreak will come to us as it came to France in the "days of terror." JOSEPH DEBAR.

CINCINNATI, Ohio, September 1, 1896.

WHO HITCHED THE CART?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The correspondent who, under the caption "The Cart before the Horse," in your issue of August 27, raises the question of the admission of women to the Johns Hopkins University, recalls a former editorial in the *Nation*, reprinted on page 164 of the collected essays ('Comments and Reflections, 1865-1895'), of Mr. E. L. Godkin. The first point emphasized by Mr. Godkin is "the unprecedented advantage of the Hopkins Trustees . . . of being left in possession of a very large bequest with complete liberty, within wide limits, as to the disposition of it, . . . and ready or willing to look at the subject [University education] from every side. . . . In other words, they are to found a University; . . . but as to the kind of University, they may exercise their discretion."

No contemporary who has watched the brilliant and public-spirited career of Johns Hopkins's president will be likely to attribute to him the University's reactionary policy towards the higher education of women. Is it, then, the Faculty or the Trustees—credited in this essay of Mr. Godkin as being "without bias or bond"—or is it the baneful influence of a conservative locality, to which the puzzling exclusion of graduate women from Johns Hopkins's graduate department is due?

Yours truly, FAIR PLAY.

NORTH-EAST HARBOR, MAINE, September 6, 1896.

Notes.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL & Co. have in preparation as gift-books Browning's 'Saul,' illustrated by Frank O. Small; 'Shakspere's Heroes on the Stage,' by Charles E. L. Wingate; 'Famous Actors of To-Day,' by the same author in collaboration with F. E. McKay and the aid of numerous portraits; and André Theuriet's 'Rustic Life in France,' translated by Helen B. Dole, with Lhermitte's illustrations.

Prof. George W. Field of Brown University has translated the first or general part of Dr. Richard Hertwig's 'Lehrbuch der Zoologie,' and it will soon be published by Henry Holt & Co.

A monograph by Judge Tourgée, 'The Battle of the Standards; or, Coin *and* Credit the Antidote for Coin *without* Credit,' is to be issued at once by G. P. Putnam's Sons, together with a new edition of Shaw's 'History of Currency.'

'A Century Book of Famous Americans,' 'Quotations for Occasions' (from Shakspere and other writers, for dinner menus and the like), and 'A Christmas Guest and Other Tales,' by Mrs. Ruth McEnery Stuart, will be published next month by the Century Company.

The Baker & Taylor Co. have nearly ready 'A Daily Thought for a Daily Endeavor,' by Eleanor A. and Eliza P. Sutphen; 'The Colonial Parson of New England,' by Frank S. Child; and 'The Regicides: A Tale of Early Colonial Times,' by Frederick Hull Cogswell.

The Macmillan Co.'s list for the coming season embraces 'Guesses at the Riddle of Existence,' with other kindred essays, by Goldwin Smith, and, by the same author, 'A Political History of England'; 'A Text-Book on the English Constitution,' by Prof. Jesse Macy of Iowa College; 'The Castles of England: Their Story and Structure,' in two volumes, fully illustrated, by Sir James D. Mackenzie, Bart.; 'European Architecture: An Historical Study,' by Russell Sturgis; 'The Bible in Old English Writers,' by Prof. Albert S. Cook of Yale; 'Old English Ballads,' edited by Hamilton W. Mabie, with designs by George Wharton Edwards; 'Selections from Chaucer for High-School Use,' by Prof. Hiram Corson of Cornell; a translation of Georg Brandes's 'William Shakspere: A Critical Study'; 'Victorian Influences,' essays by Frederick Harrison; a translation of Ratzel's 'History of Mankind,' in three volumes, with many colored plates, maps, and cuts; 'Principles of Mental Development: Social Interpretations,' by Prof. J. Mark Baldwin of Princeton; translations from Leibnitz, by Alfred Gideon Langley, under the title 'New Essays concerning the Human Understanding'; 'A History of Elementary Mathematics,' by Prof. F. Cajori of Colorado College; 'An Introduction to Public Finances,' by Prof. Carl C. Plehn of the University of California; 'The History of Modern Painting,' by Richard Muther, in three volumes, imperial octavo, with more than 1,300 illustrations (a subscription work); 'Stained Glass,' by Henry Holiday, with colored and other illustrations; 'Rocks, Rock-Weathering, and Soils,' by Prof. George P. Merrill of Columbian University; 'The Norfolk Broads,' by Mrs. Anna Bowman Dodd, illustrated by Joseph Pennell, who also embellishes a new edition of Irving's 'Alhambra' for the Cranford Series; 'African Travels,' by Miss Kingsley; 'Sir George Tressady,' by Mrs. Humphry Ward; 'The Other House,' by Henry James; 'The Choir Invisible,' by James Lane Allen; 'Soldiers' Stories,' a book for boys, by Rudyard Kipling; 'Gutter Children,' described with pen and pencil by Phil May; 'On Blue Waters: The Life and Experience of a Yankee Sailor,' by Fred. B. Williams; 'Elements of Grammar,' by Prof. George R. Carpenter of Columbia; and 'The Foundation of the German Empire, 1815-'17,' by J. W. Headlam. We must pass over numerous new editions, but will make exception in the case of Miss Fay's useful 'Music Study in Germany,' and of Mr. John Bartlett's 'Concordance to Shakspere' at a price within the reach of every one who can afford books of reference at all.

Copeland & Day, Boston, have nearly ready 'The Listener in the Town,' 'The Listener in the Country,' by Joseph Edgar Chamberlin, "Listener" for the Boston *Transcript;* and Dr. Richard Garnett's 'CXXIV Sonnets from Dante, Petrarch and Camoens,' in translation.

'Science Sketches,' by Dr. David Starr Jordan, of Leland Stanford University, and 'The Method of Darwin,' by Frank Cramer, are announced by A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago.

Pending the decision of the question whether support can be found for a complete edition of the works of Théophile Gautier, including both his dramatic and artistic *feuilletons* in their entirety, his admirer, M. de Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, offers to make a free gift to the publisher, on the realization of the enterprise, of the inedited correspondence of Gautier, collected by him from his youth upwards.

A reprint of John Morley's Life of Richard Cobden in two volumes (Macmillan) must be thought timely in the midst of our economic awakening, even if the tariff discussion be for the nonce in abeyance. The logical relation between protection and free silver can never be severed by the protectionist party getting on to a gold platform. The price of this work

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has undergone the usual reduction. From the same firm we have received a fourth edition of Charles Cowden Clarke's winnowed 'Riches of Chaucer,' with its memoir to which much must be added from later researches; and two further volumes in each of the charming Dent series of translations—from Daudet, 'Thirty Years of Paris and My Literary Life,' and 'Recollections of an Artist'; from Balzac, 'César Birotteau' and 'Modeste Mignon.'

In William T. Hornaday's 'The Man who became a Savage' (Buffalo: The Peter Paul Book Co.) a man of means, in a New York city, thoroughly disgusted with a place "where the air is blue with aggravations and annoyances," unwilling "to wear his life out fighting mean men, mean corporations, mean courts, and mean politics," learns of some "honest, moral savages" among the head-hunting Dyaks, and at once starts for Borneo. On the way "the absconder is held up" by typhoid fever in Montana, and is nursed to health by a much-abused woman, whose relish for society equals his own. They fall in love, they marry, they go to Dohong, where they are well received, and, after helping to drive out liquor-traders and gold-hunters, are adopted by the grateful natives. This sort of love story is interspersed with many thrilling adventures, and some accounts of Dyak battles, of their head-houses and customs in general, tells of the capture of the orang-utan, and makes a roundabout appeal for women's rights, a novel temperance lecture, a depressing exhibit of lawless white men, and an altogether favorable picture of savages not yet spoiled by civilization. The author's field, in his first venture into fiction, is somewhat out of the travelled routes. His purpose was not so much to do fine writing as to produce an interesting story; in this he has succeeded.

Dr. George Albert Boulenger's 'Catalogue of the Snakes in the British Museum (Natural History),' completed by the third volume, is a most important contribution to ophiology. In most respects the work is very well done indeed. Besides the great additions to knowledge by the author, his book furnishes a new point of departure in the study of the order, and prepares the way for advances by others that could not be made with a literature scattered over the pages of all sorts of publications. The catalogue is descriptive; it recognizes 1,639 species of snakes. The arrangement is much improved, though a general criticism to be urged applies to the amount of bunching together. The sea snakes and the cobras are put in the family of the most common harmless species, and the rattlesnakes are made to belong to the same family as the vipers. Similar bunching is apparent in genera, species, and varieties. Mainly the synonymy is drawn from descriptive publications. Those relating to anatomy, habits, etc., are ignored, as also all those in which the names are not accompanied by definitions, even though they refer to species previously described by competent and cited authorities; the amount which they in the synonymy might add to knowledge of genetic affinities or of distribution being thus entirely disregarded. In consequence, there is confusion in regard to authorities, credit being given to later authors for what really was pointed out by the earlier, and a considerable number of the genera will be renamed in attempts to restore prior designations. The omission of many synonyms that had been defined is probably due to inadvertence. Such a work is necessarily an approximation; the present ranks among the best.

An exceedingly valuable contribution to the painful history of witchcraft persecutions is Dr. Sigmund Riezler's 'Geschichte der Hexenprozesse in Bayern' (Stuttgart: Cotta). Hitherto no adequate account of the origin and spread of this delusion and the prosecutions to which it gave rise in Bavaria has ever been written, so that Dr. Riezler may be justly regarded as a pioneer in this special province of research. He calls attention to the inveteracy of these phenomena, and states that the authentic history of the Bavarian stock, comprising fourteen centuries, is, during nearly thirteen centuries of this period, pervaded and more or less conditioned by a belief in witchcraft, which had its source in old German paganism and was therefore treated at first by the Christian Church as mere superstition. During the thirteenth century, however, witchcraft began to be regarded as a terrible reality, in which the Church detected the direct agency of the devil, and thus laid the foundation for the fearful persecutions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (1589–1631), so vividly described in the third chapter of the present work. The first effective reaction against prosecutions for witchcraft in Bavaria emanated from the jurists of Ingolstadt; also the 'Theologia Scholastica' of the Jesuit Tanner (published in the same city in 1626–27) contains as bold a protest against judicial torture and other perversions of justice in such trials as the prudent father perhaps dared to make. In the concluding chapter we have an account of the gradual disappearance of the delusion, leading to the abolition of judicial torture on July 7, 1806, and the publication of a new criminal code on October 1, 1813, in which heresy, witchcraft, and magic are not mentioned. In the appendix we have a full analysis of Hartlieb's 'Buch der Zauberei,' written in 1456 and preserved in a Heidelberg codex, and the text of an "Interrogatoria" dated 1622 and printed from a manuscript in the Munich archives.

In a pamphlet of fifteen pages entitled 'Vater, Sohn und Fürsprecher in der Babylonischen Gottesvorstellung,' and just published by Hinrich in Leipzig, Dr. Heinrich Zimmern, Professor of Assyriology in the university of that city, makes a short, but exceedingly suggestive, contribution to the science of comparative religion. The Babylonian Trinity consisted of Ea the Father, Marduk the Son, and a fire-god bearing different names, Gibil, Girru, and Nusku, and performing the office of a paraclete. In the passages cited, Marduk serves as mediator between Ea and the human race, and is sent to heal men of their infirmities and in one case to cast out seven devils. In the ceremonial of the Babylonian court, the function of intercessor between the sovereign and his subjects was assigned to his oldest son, who graciously heard the requests of suppliants and laid them before the monarch. The same ceremonial was naturally assumed to be observed in the court of heaven, where God the Father could be approached by the children of men and made to listen to their petitions only through the mediation of his Son.

Kiepert and Huelsen's 'Formæ Urbis Romæ Antiquæ' (Berlin: Reimer) contains three maps. The first is of the republican period, the second of the imperial, and each is on the scale of 1:10,000, half the scale employed by Canina. The third, on a much larger scale (1:2,500), covers the Palatine, the forums and their neighborhood in the imperial age. All three are entirely new maps, based upon the latest surveys and discoveries. Ancient remains are entered in black, modern streets and important buildings in red. The maps, a little over two feet square, are folded loosely in the cover of an accompanying volume, which contains, besides the preface and a bibliography, a most welcome *Nomenclator Topographicus*, compiled by Huelsen in 100 pages. This does for Rome what Milchhoefer's *Schriftquellen* has done for Athens. It is a list of all the ancient buildings and the most important other monuments, together with references to the ancient authorities and to significant mediæval and modern books in which they find mention. The names of the editors are a sufficient guarantee of the excellence of this work, which from its convenient size and moderate price will take a place that Lanciani's great map can never obtain.

The important work which is being done by Mme. Th. Bentzon in making American life and American literature known to the French is continued in the last number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in the form of a study of the work of Mary E. Wilkins. The best method is chosen for giving the readers of the *Revue* some comprehension of Miss Wilkins's artistic quality. One story is in the first instance translated entire, choice being happily made of 'A New England Nun,' and there follow sketches of other situations, and a fuller rendering of the outline of 'Pembroke,' together with much keen and sympathetic criticism. Madame Blanc (to give her her rightful name) is fully alive to the difficulty of the task of making the New England temperament, and especially the New England abhorrence of a life of self-indulgence, intelligible to the French consciousness, but she is successful, here and elsewhere, so far as the difficulties of the task are not insuperable. The critic is herself not only a skilful novelist, but also an energetic worker in the movement for the reformation of French manners, of which Melchior de Vogüé, Paul Desjardins, and M. René Doumic are the chief leaders.

A frank, though anonymous, writer in *La Réforme Sociale* gives a very gloomy view of the present condition and future prospects of the French Congo, a territory three times as large as France. Since 1884, the second year of the colony, the number of mercantile houses has increased from nine to fifteen, of whom seven only are French. There are four planters, one being a Frenchman with capital; but the officials have multiplied sixfold, from 32 to 187. The receipts from customs have risen from $40,000 to $170,000, an increase due chiefly to the fact that the duties are three times as great as they were twelve years ago, though a rebate of 60 per cent. is allowed on importations from France. Since 1890 the commercial development has been stationary, and is now apparently beginning to decline, a Dutch company being the only one conducting its business with a profit. The only persons benefited by the colony are the officials, the missionaries and the blacks dependent upon them. The writer closes with the remark that it seems as if the European nations had been blinded by Providence in their mad rush to acquire in equatorial Africa territory which had no present or prospective value.

—The September number of *Harper's Magazine* meets a need of the moment by calling attention, through Prof. Woodrow Wilson's article "First in Peace," to the qualities of character which, in the opinion of our forefathers, constituted a leader of the people. It clearly appears from this chapter of Washington's history that dignity and reserve of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manner were no obstacles to popular confidence and affection, "a grave sincerity" having characterized his bearing at all times. Fulsome congratulation of his fellow-countrymen upon their greatness, real or imaginary, formed no part of his public utterances, which were marked rather by a determination to impress upon them a sense of their peculiar dangers and mistakes. Wealth, with sound judgment and economy in the care of it, did not make him less a hero in the eyes of the plain people, his pleasure in the profitable and thrifty management of his estate having been patent to all observers, and forming now a point on which Prof. Wilson dwells with picturesque and vivid detail. No time could be better than this for clearing up false conceptions of our national ideals, and for bringing out in their true proportion the full personality of the leaders with whose names our politicians still conjure. Mr. Theodore S. Woolsey has contrived, while dealing with so apparently remote a subject as old silver, to keep his patriotism in view by suggesting that the productions of silversmiths who emigrated to this country and "did as good work here as at home" should be at least as valuable and interesting to ourselves as any other. To give to old American-made plate, he goes on to suggest, an historical and commercial value, collections similar to those shown within the past fifteen years in Amsterdam, Carlsruhe, Budapest, and many European capitals must be exposed to examination in this country. From a third article, "A Summer among Cliff Dwellings," may be drawn flattering proof that our western desert is not outdone by the so-called Old World in its capacity to fire imagination by the antiquity of its relics.

—In the current *Atlantic* Prof. McMaster emphasizes his own dissent from the belief of the fathers that the people were not fit to be intrusted with the high duty of electing the President. His article, however, which begins at the point of time when the reader has been loath to break off in Prof. Wilson's, leaves room for an opinion that the changes between the first elections and that of 1840, memorable for the introduction of "all the paraphernalia still resorted to as a means of arousing the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the emotional voter," have been of the nature of a revolution as much as of an evolution. A further transfer of political power which has taken place since the time when the Constitution was still practically unamended by the action of successive political parties, is dealt with by Prof. Frederick J. Turner in an article on "The Problem of the West." The unprejudiced temper in which this Western scholar treats of the questions of the now ruling section of the country gives another cause for regret that "the influence of the scholarly, thinking, philosophical class is not felt in American progress nearly as much as it ought to be." For the faith of those who believe in the inherent capacity of democracies to work out their own salvation in the long run, there is ample encouragement to be found in Booker T. Washington's "Awakening of the Negro." The school directors of most Northern towns might profit greatly by a careful consideration of the results of industrial training (joined with academic) in promoting "thrift, economy, and push" in certain portions of the "Black Belt of the South." Fiction in this number, which includes part of a serial by Henry James, is represented by Miss Jewett, Kate Douglas Wiggin, Kate Chopin, and Mary Hartwell Catherwood—a fair indication of the proportion of creditable work in this line now done by women, inasmuch as the *Atlantic* eschews the story, short or long, which is lacking in literary merit.

—The loss which all lovers of good quality in current fiction have lately suffered is brought home to readers of *Scribner's* by Prof. Brander Matthews's sketch of the life and work of his friend and former collaborator H. C. Bunner. Mr. Bunner's versatility, as editor of *Puck* and as a maker of bound volumes, broadened the circle of those to whom he gave pleasure, while the sentiment with which, as Prof. Matthews points out, he clothed his native city of New York, constantly gave to his prose and his verse an American color and tone of a sort that can ill be spared. The new National Portrait Gallery on the "finest site in Europe" finds an efficient introducer to the public of the magazines in Cosmo Monkhouse, who does, with the aid of illustrations, as much, perhaps, as can be done by the unsatisfactory medium of words to show what has been added to the overflowing wealth of the sights of London by the better housing of scattered and hitherto partly inaccessible paintings. "Song, Youth, and Sorrow," by William Cranston Lawton, is a creditable experiment in metre, full of agreeable suggestions of poetic studies. Frederic Irland and Frank French supply two articles of the type, now almost indispensable to a magazine, which deals with open-air themes, and leans heavily on illustrations for support; one describing "Sport in an Untouched American Wilderness," the other making "Country Roads" its subject. August F. Jaccaci continues the account of his rambles in the country of Cervantes, while Vierge keeps up the vivacity and finish of his spirited illustrations.

—Rival handiwork to that of this clever French draughtsman is to be found in the *Century* in the pictures by Joseph Pennell, who has chosen the south of Spain as the scene of a summer's work. The element of human interest, so conspicuous in Vierge's work, dwindles before the beauty of the architecture or the "almost exaggerated picturesqueness" of the landscape as seen and portrayed by Mr. Pennell. Mrs. Pennell, as usual, plays cicerone to her husband's pencil, and keeps her accustomed balance between enthusiasm and common sense. The results of thirty years of almost continuous palæontological exploration are put before the reader in condensed form in Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn's "Prehistoric Quadrupeds of the Rockies." The elaborate illustrations to this article are by Charles Knight, who, by aid of skull and skeleton, has attempted to reproduce for the American Museum of Natural History a pictorial idea of the living forms of ancient beasts over whose graves about three miles of rock has been lying vertically for more than a million of years. In another paper an Arizona miner briefly rehearses his adventures in the goldfields of Guiana, and casts his vote in favor of the stringent enforcement of the British colonial laws, as preferable to the rule of chance. But the more noticeable portion of the number consists of serials, upon one of which at least, "Sir George Tressady," all eyes are expectantly turned.

—Mr. Oscar Browning, the editor of Lord Gower's dispatches from Paris during the early years of the Revolution, has given, in the August *Cosmopolis*, an analysis of certain documents which will, if authentic, "make it necessary to rewrite the tragedy of the Reign of Terror." They are one part of the Dropmore papers, and belong to the fourteenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. They consist of twenty-eight bulletins, and purport to be an account of the proceedings of the Committee of Public Safety written day by day by one of its secretaries, an ardent royalist, and transmitted to the British Government through Francis Drake, the English Resident at Genoa. Mr. Browning evidently does not regard the papers as above suspicion, but to any one familiar with the history of the Great Committee it seems surprising that he should have deemed an extended account of them necessary until their character had been carefully determined. On their face they contradict much that has already been established on the best historical evidence; and, among other things, represent the committee as more reckless and ferocious than the *Septembriseurs*. They reveal Sieyès, who was "content during the Terror with the simple glory of living," in the rôle of one of the most energetic and bloodthirsty of all. Fortunately, through the editorial skill of the French historian F. A. Aulard, the acts of the Committee are now in course of publication, the ninth volume, which recently appeared, carrying the records well into the winter of 1793–1794. These records show, to take one example, not only that the Committee did not plan the famous scene of the 7th of November, as Mr. Browning's documents assert, but that the members took the lead in repressing the anti-Christian crusade. Truly, if Pitt expended much English gold upon documents of this sort, he was not a thrifty statesman.

—Prof. E. B. Tylor has in the *Nineteenth Century* for July an article on the Matriarchal Family System, which, like everything he writes, is valuable. He thinks that Westermarck's inquiry (in his 'History of Human Marriage') tends to prove that the groundwork of the human family is, in accordance with the older view, patriarchal. If it is true, as naturalists and hunters tell us, that a sort of family life, lasting, for the sake of the young, beyond a single pairing season, exists among the higher manlike apes, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the family is an instinctive and not an artificial institution. If the male gorilla keeps watch and ward over his progeny, it is difficult to avoid seeing in him the antetype of the "house-father" and patriarch. What, then, are we to say of the rival theory, that the patriarchal family is a late institution—that, in the real primitive family, descent was traced from the mother? According to the matriarchal theory, the early condition of mankind was "promiscuity." There was neither marriage nor giving in marriage; instead of organized society there was a horde. Paternity being impossible to establish, descent was traced on the mother's, or "safe," side. What are we to do with all the evidence relating to very primitive races still extant, who reckon descent, not as we do, but on the female side?

—Prof. Tylor's answer to these questions is, that the essential point in the maternal system, where it exists (as among the Pueblo Indians, visited by him in 1884), is that the wife remains in her own family. The husband may live with her, or live elsewhere than in the wife's house, but in any case the family is the wife's, the power is lodged in the hands of her brothers and uncles, and the husband cannot be the "head of the house."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under the patriarchal system, the Sabine women are carried off by force; young Lochinvar secures his bride in the same manner; under the maternal system families keep their married daughters. The system is also, confessedly, connected with that of exogamy, by which a people is divided into intermarrying classes or clans, no man or woman being permitted to marry within his or her own; but while maternal peoples are exogamous, exogamous peoples may be either paternal or maternal. Exogamic rules are certainly not contrived to prevent all marriage between kinsfolk, because they take account of only one line of descent, prohibiting the remotest cousins on the mother's side, but allowing the nearest on the father's, or *vice versa*. Prof. Tylor's conclusion from these facts is that the object of exogamy is not moral, but political; the purpose of intermarriage being to bind together in peace and alliance clans which might be otherwise hostile. The same cause which leads to exogamy will lead to the maternal system, but it is an artificial system, introduced as a substitute for and in opposition to the natural paternal system. Whenever the social pressure is removed, the maternalized husband will emancipate himself from his inferior position, and the tendency will be towards a universal paternalism, both in family life and in the system of descent such as generally exists throughout the world to-day. Falling in with a party of Ojibwas, Prof. Tylor asked a girl what was her totem, to which she replied that she was a Beaver. "'Then,' I said, 'your mother was a Beaver'; but her reply was, 'No, it was my father.' They all seemed as much surprised at being thought to count clanship on the mother's side as I was to find that the customs of their forefathers had become strange to them."

—M. Victor Turquan publishes in the *Revue Bleue* of August 15 a curious study entitled "La Statisque aux Salons," in which he enumerates the works which have been exhibited at the Palais de l'Industrie and at the Champ-de-Mars, together with the artists who have produced them, classified by sex, civil condition, nationality, and, in the case of those of French birth, by their native department. The Salon of 1896 was the one hundred and twenty-second in order. This does not mean that the Salon is only a hundred and twenty-two years old, for its exhibitions have not always been annual. There were ten Salons under Louis XIV., twenty-six under Louis XV., nine under Louis XVI., nine under the First Republic, five under the First Empire, six under the Restoration, sixteen under Louis Philippe, four under the Second Republic, thirteen under the Second Empire, and twenty-four under the Third Republic. The Salons were quite as irregular in other respects as they were in their chronology. There are surprising differences, for example, in the number of works shown. To take the records of this century only, the exhibition of the year 1800 included only 275 numbers. This figure increased gradually until it became 1,210 at the end of the first decade. Then it fell off for a while until the year 1817; since that date it has steadily increased, until at the present time the number of works offered each year is about 9,000. The number accepted and shown annually varies naturally as the severity of the jury varies. Under the reign of Napoleon III. the number of works shown averaged about 3,000. In the year 1872, 4,367 were offered, of which 2,067 were received. In 1875, 7,345 were offered and 3,862 received. In 1880, when the jury was extraordinarily yielding, 9,254 works were offered, of which no less than 7,327 were shown. In 1891, however, the pendulum had swung to the other extreme, and out of 8,181 works presented only 3,660 were received. This severity has not been kept up, and in the present year 4,879 works were exhibited, being almost exactly half of those presented.

—This year, too, showed at the Champs-Élysées the work of 1,517 painters, of whom 339, or more than a fifth, were foreigners. In the 197 women included in this number 67 were foreigners, or one in three. Among the women painters there were twice as many spinsters as there were wives and widows. The United States stands first in numbers on the list of nations to which the foreign painters belong. We furnish 65 of them; the British Isles 60, Russia 24, Spain 27, and so on. Almost all countries are represented at the Salon except those of the yellow race. M. Turquan furnishes a map of France shaded so as to show graphically the relative fertility in the production of artists of different parts of the country. The most favored regions are the valley of the Seine, Marseilles and its neighborhood, Toulouse, and Bordeaux. Morbihan, Landes, Gers, a half-dozen central departments, Savoy, Basses-Alpes, and Corsica are the most barren. The northern half of France is, much more than the southern, productive of artists, and of this the valley of the Seine is by far the most fertile part—the *hortus inclusus* of the Muse.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives. By M. P. Follett. With an introduction by Albert Bushnell Hart, Ph.D. Longmans, Green & Co. 1896.

THE Speakership of to-day is a product of our legislative circumstances and conditions. This office, without a prescribed term, and almost without a prescribed power, which is merely mentioned in the Constitution and hardly mentioned in the statutes, and is filled by one of the houses of Congress without the co-operation of the other or the approval of the President, has become, in the opinion of many wise observers, the most powerful position in the Government. At the same time, at the other end of the Capitol, is an officer presiding over the higher branch of the national legislature, who is of higher rank, who is chosen by the people of the United States, whose term of office is prescribed by the Constitution, yet whose office is also regarded by many wise observers as the most *powerless* in the country.

The legislative circumstances and conditions which have produced this result are these: During the present century the business management of the House of Commons has gradually and practically become vested in a "steering committee," as it would be called in Congress, popularly known as the Ministry. This committee determines, with some exceptions, what business shall be brought before the House, and what shall not be. It is true that the Ministry is not termed a committee, and that it is not formally appointed by the House, and that its members perform executive duties; nevertheless it manages the business of the House, and, if it becomes incapable of maintaining that management, the House discharges it and incidentally turns its members out of their executive offices, and obtains a new committee of management, a new ministry. The Constitution of the United States did not provide for legislative management. It was supposed that each of the houses could take care of itself. In the Senate this is still done, and in the House it continued to be done so long as the House continued to be a self-manageable, compact body. But as the House grew larger and was composed more and more of undisciplined and inexperienced material, management became more and more necessary; and this management gradually but ever increasingly was assumed by the one man who possessed a semblance of authority over the House. Only two powers were intrusted to the Speaker—the power to recognize members or not recognize them, and the power to appoint committees. But these two powers may be likened to two grains of mustard seed planted in a hotbed. From them has sprung, and out of them has grown, all the overshadowing authority, positive and negative, which is wielded by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The story of this extraordinary growth is told in the book which we are now reviewing.

The explanation of this book, the reasons why it came to be, the lines upon which it proceeds, and the methods by which it has been wrought, are best told by a few sentences in Prof. Hart's introduction and the author's preface:

"This book," says Prof. Hart, "represents the strenuous labor of a well-equipped investigator for more than half of each year during four successive years. Whatever may be done by diligent search into the records, by visits to Washington, by conferences with ex-Speakers, and by a comparison of all her varied material, has been done by the author. . . . Miss Follett has made her own discoveries, arranged her own material, and expressed her own results in her own words, subject only to criticism and suggestion."

"To Prof. Hart," says Miss Follett, "under whose direction this work has been prepared in the Radcliffe College Seminary of American History and Institutions, I am under the deepest obligation for advice, for valuable criticism, and for constant interest; without his continued help, and without the stimulus of frequent discussion with him, this study would never have been completed."

In saying this, we have no doubt that Miss Follett speaks as truly as modestly—that is, that she states her case with scientific accuracy. It is always reassuring to reader or critic when he finds that an author understands his own limitations; for that indicates hopefully that the author comprehended the details of his work ere he welded them together and set them before the public in the form of a book. Many people will admit that this is a remarkable book for a young author; many more people will admit that it is a remarkable book for a young lady; but when we read what may be called the practical part of the book, the multifarious instrumentalities of the Speaker's power, the things which he does, the things which he refrains from doing, the reasons upon which he acts and the influences which restrain him from acting, and view in it, clearly, the complexities of that tumultuous parliamentary body which we know sometimes as the "bear garden" and sometimes as the House of Representatives, we are tempted to go farther and say that it is a remarkable book to have been written by any other person than a member of Congress—by a member having much experience, studious habits, commendable industry, and endowed with unusual powers of analysis and generalization. Miss Follett, we are informed, is a daughter of "good old New England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stock," a graduate of Radcliffe, and a student of history in other institutions.

Having said this much of the author, we shall now speak of the book precisely as if it had been written by any other person. It consists of eleven chapters, which may be assigned to five parts. First, we have the history and growth of the Speakership—the first appearance of a Speaker in the House of Commons, the English Speaker, the Colonial Speaker, the Continental Speaker, and so on to the Speakership of the Constitution. Second comes the choice of the Speaker, the process of selecting him, the method of electing him, the troubles of contested elections, and the great contested election instances of 1839, 1849, 1855, and 1859. Third, we have the most attractive portion of the book, "The Personal Element in the Speakership"; the early Speakers; the eminent Speakers; the Speakers in whose hands the powers of the Speakership have been expanded or abused—Clay, Polk, Winthrop, Banks, Pennington, Blaine, Keifer, etc. Fourth, we have the most useful portion of the book, to which seven of its eleven chapters are given, the powers and prerogatives of the Speaker. It is this portion of the book which is a valuable contribution to studies of Constitutional law, and the study of a vital subject. It should be read by every thoughtful citizen. Finally there comes "The Speaker's Place in our Political System," or, rather, the controlling influence of the developed Speakership as it now exists upon the law-making power, and the part it plays in directing or thwarting the political purposes of the country.

It is evident that the author has kept a tight rein upon herself with the intent of scrupulously keeping in the proper road of one who journeys through the regions of constitutional history; but there is one part of her work in which, we think, she might well have allowed herself more rein—we mean the part in which a young author is expected to err in the opposite extreme, the dramatic part. By dramatic part we of course do not refer to the screechings and howlings and all the crudities and absurdities which biennially demonstrate how much infantile material there is in the House of Representatives. The dramatic element plays no unimportant part in the affairs of men; and there have been times when the election of the Speaker was a matter of supreme national importance and the event one of truly dramatic interest. Miss Follett sketches in a dozen pages, clearly but too briefly, "the four great crises in the choice of Speaker, in 1839, 1849, 1855, and 1859." The most important of these was the election of Banks in 1855, or rather in 1856, for the contest lasted more than two months, and in a community quivering in the excitement of distractions which were soon to plunge the country into civil war. If any parliamentary conflict was ever entitled to full historical treatment, including the dramatic, it was this election of the Speaker in 1856, and if there is any book in which one might reasonably expect to find it, it is in this book devoted exclusively to the Speaker of the House. Miss Follett gives four pages to it, and depicts the political situation clearly; but she does not tell us of the counter attack on Banks which came perilously near to defeating his election—the attack founded on the once famous phrase which he used in a speech out of Congress, that he would, if necessary, "let the Union slide." Neither does she tell us of the technical objection which was raised to his election on the 133d ballot; nor of the handsome conduct of his leading opponent, Gov. Aiken of South Carolina, who rose and conceded the election of the member from Massachusetts, and requested permission of the House to escort him to the chair. This portion of the book will bear amplifying, and amplification will make it more interesting to the general reader, and will preserve some bits of history which should not be lost.

In this connection, too, it may be noted that Miss Follett's mind is so stored with the facts and incidents of our legislative history, and her intercourse with historical scholars like Prof. Hart has been so frequent and familiar, that she has come to overestimate the knowledge, or at least the memory, of ordinary readers. We do not recall a page in the book for which we would recommend condensation—a rare virtue, indeed, in books of the present day—but there are many pages which would be the better for amplification. The reader of history in a busy world needs to know what the writer is writing about without stopping to cogitate and recall. What, for instance, will the reader who is not fresh from Adams's 'Administration of Jefferson' make of the following paragraph (p. 322) on the first reading of it?

"An extreme illustration of executive influence was Jefferson's plan for breaking up Randolph's coterie in order to stop their steady opposition. An attempt was made to awe Monroe; Nicholson, Randolph's strongest supporter, was made Judge of the Maryland Circuit. 'The Speaker remained to be dealt with,' continues Mr. Adams in his account of this incident; 'to buy him was out of the question; to crush him was only a last resort; no other resource was left than to coax him. "Some enemy, whom we know not, is sowing tares between us," wrote the President to the Speaker, at the moment when he was warning Monroe, and lifting Nicholson to the bench. "Between you and myself nothing but opportunities of explanation can be necessary to defeat these endeavors. At least, on my part, my confidence in you is so unqualified that nothing further is necessary for my satisfaction."' Jefferson's tactics were successful. He infused his own ideas into the House, got rid of the most rebellious spirits, triumphed over the Speaker, and successfully dominated Congress."

On the subject of the quorum, Miss Follett deflects from her plain historic road and takes part in what must still be regarded as an unsettled and recurring political controversy. Her views and opinions and reasons, moreover, are but a reflex of those of Speaker Reed. A partisan argument is pardonable if there be somebody at hand ready to answer it. Miss Follett's is not a partisan argument; but her book is one which lays down principles intended not merely for the last Congress, or the next Congress, or the present condition of things, but apparently for all time. Such a book, if it would be philosophical, must, on a controverted question, fully present both sides. It is not enough for it to state objections merely to bowl them down. It must go deep—deeper than the disputants—and treat the subject in a truly comprehensive way. Miss Follett, like Mr. Reed, goes no deeper than the facts upon the surface—that there are members present who do not vote, and without their votes there is no quorum, and without a quorum nothing can be done. Thereupon, like Mr. Reed, she concludes that the way to have a quorum is to count it. Political expedients which are good enough for a strong, determined, partisan presiding officer are not good enough for a philosophical writer, whose business, if he take up the problem at all, is to go to the bottom of it and fully discuss it and thoroughly solve it. Here, one side perceives an evil, the absence of a quorum, and the other side perceives an evil, the danger of allowing one person on his mere inspection of the House to declare a quorum present; but behind these lies a third and greater evil which both sides may perceive, and should perceive, and some day will perceive—an evil which the philosophical writer certainly should perceive—viz., that this "counting a quorum" means minority legislation—the artificial enactment of a law by perhaps one-third of the House plus one vote, when nearly two-thirds of the House may be opposed to it.

Miss Follett apparently regards the refusal of a member to vote and make a quorum and a dilatory motion as one and the same thing—as obstruction—the obstruction of national legislation by the perverse conduct of the individual member. She cites "one of the oldest rules of the House" as the moral and legal authority which governs the case, and says that every member is "under strong moral obligation to obey the rules requiring him to vote," and that "his acceptance of his trust, and especially his oath of office, make it incumbent upon him to discharge the duty of voting, or at least to help to make up that number by which alone business can be accomplished." But there is an immense moral difference between the member who sits still and holds his tongue and simply refrains from helping the minority of the House to impose their will on the country in the form of a statute, and the member who forces himself upon the House, consumes its time, and, by his positive action, obstructs its business and thwarts the will of the majority. The difference is that the one is trying to maintain and the other is seeking to overthrow the principle that in this country the majority must govern; or, stated differently, the one member is merely *not helping the minority to govern*, and the other is *preventing the majority from governing*. It is true that members should attend the sittings of the House and assist in the transaction of its business, and should not evade the responsibility of voting. These, speaking in a general way, are their duties. It is also true that the Constitution makes a majority of the House a quorum, and allows the majority of a quorum to pass a bill, and that in ordinary matters of legislation this is a convenience. But does this mean that a minority of the House, when it chances to be the majority of a quorum, may seize its opportunity and pass a measure of great magnitude, and at the same time compel those who are opposed to the measure to help enact it into a law? In such tactics the less said about "moral obligation," the better. If the majority of the House think that a bill should be passed, it is their duty to be there and pass it. But should an upright, conscientious man, against his inmost convictions, be compelled by a rule of the House to assist in enacting a statute which he deems to be unjust, unconstitutional, or prejudicial to the general welfare? And is not the obligation imposed by such a rule in such a condition of things a very artificial "moral obligation"—one which must count for very little against the higher obligation which requires the legislator to legislate for what he deems the good of the country? And what matters it whether a man votes "aye" or "nay" so long as his vote will pass the bill?

It does not seem to be observed that there are, indeed, two classes of legislative matters, the ordinary, in which there is no moral or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political question involved, and the extraordinary or political, in which the whole country is interested (as the "salary-grab"), or upon which the whole country is divided (as a tariff bill). In the former, public convenience requires that the majority of the quorum may legislate. In the latter, public convenience is a secondary and trivial consideration. Public honesty and political responsibility are not to be frittered away by rules of the House. What would have been thought of the moral obligation of a member who, by keeping silent, could have defeated the "salary-grab," and by voting "nay" could have passed it? In this country it is the majority which rules, and the majority must be held to its political responsibility. If a new political policy cannot be established by a political majority, it must wait. Obstructing the action of the majority is one thing; relieving them from responsibility is another.

Starting from the premises of "the absolute necessity that some one must assure to the House the opportunity for the proper discharge of its functions," and of the need of leadership and "the lack of leadership" in the House, Miss Follett reaches the conclusions that "the Speaker's power is necessary and salutary"; that "he was never intended to be a moderator"; that "he is the only visible means of escape from a legislative chaos," and that "it is to the interest of good government that the Speaker exercise the responsibility which has gradually come upon him." We deplore this, or rather we deplore that the premises do not cover the whole case, and that the conclusions stop where they do; for our author reasons with such strength and clearness, and fortifies her position with so many illustrative facts, that a large part of her readers will accept her statements as the whole of the case and her conclusions as the end of the whole matter. Even so good a constitutional scholar and so clear a thinker as Prof. Hart says: "I am convinced by it that the Speaker's present status is a natural, normal, and inevitable development of our system of government, and promises good and not evil." These views may be sound for to-day and to-morrow—for this Congress and the next—but they are assuredly short-sighted. Moreover, the ability with which they are presented serves to veil the dangers and evils of the system from the growing intelligence of the country.

What is that system? Miss Follett accurately defines it: The House of Representatives "*is no longer the legislative power*"; "*it is not even the maker of the legislative power; it is but the maker of the real maker, the Speaker.*" The legislative work of the House is done, not by the House, but by fifty-two little star-chambers termed "standing committees." They sit in secret; they keep no record of their proceedings; nothing can be considered which they do not bring before the House; they report what they choose; they withhold what they choose; they are appointed by the Speaker; his power to appoint "is an absolute power"; and he can "constitute the committees so that he may to a great extent procure or prevent what legislation he wishes." Finally, the Speaker can recognize whom he will, and can refuse to recognize whom he will. He can "practically take away the representation of a district." "Cases are not wanting where members have sat through two years of service without ever being permitted to 'catch the Speaker's eye.'" Who is this national dictator? A man selected and chosen by the 357th part of the people of the United States. Well does Miss Follett say: "His status as the leader of the House of Representatives should be looked squarely in the face"; and his position is now "the possession of such important prerogatives without definite responsibility."

Under the head of "omissions" we must express a regret that Miss Follett has not added a chapter on the business methods of the House of Commons. Her work is entitled "The Speaker of the House of Representatives," but it might with equal propriety be entitled "The Way Congress Does Business." A clear statement of the modern methods by which the House of Commons does business would, in connection with her other work, form an invaluable lesson for her countrymen at this time and upon this subject. She alludes to Parliamentary proceedings and the control of the Ministry; but she does not tell us how the legislative time is apportioned between the majority and minority; nor how it is divided between the Government and the members; nor how the right of recognition is distributed without favor among individual members by lot. She alludes to the selection of the committees by a committee; but she does not point out that these committees are composed of members as absolutely impartial as jurymen; that the committees sit with open doors; that they keep a record of all that is said and done, and that that record is published daily for the information of the House. She extols the control of the Premier over the business of Parliament, and, most wisely, his responsibility for what is done and for what is not done; but she does not delineate how his authority is regulated and limited; how he must daily apprise every member of every motion or resolution or bill or amendment which he will bring before the House; how he must yield part of his authority to the Opposition, and part of it to the individual member, and how he and the Opposition and the youngest member stand, when on the floor of the House, upon an equal footing before the higher authority of an impartial Speaker. Of our new American Premier she forcibly says: "He *at one moment* decides what business shall come before the House; *at the next*, appoints the man who shall guide the House during its deliberation upon that business; then may himself take a responsible part in the affair—managing it, debating, and voting upon it—and, finally, he decides questions of order which have arisen *from this very matter!*" Assuredly this is Premiership run mad. Miss Follett has shown herself to be admirably qualified to analyze and depict the procedure of English legislation and show the American citizen that the British Premier does not and cannot exercise the unlimited and inconsistent powers of the American Speaker, and that there would be a revolution if he did. Let us hope that a future edition of her work will give us this much-needed lesson.

MORE FICTION.

An Odd Situation. By Stanley Waterloo. Chicago: Way & Williams.

A Mountain Woman. By Elia W. Peattie. Chicago: Way & Williams.

Jersey Street and Jersey Lane. By H. C. Bunner. Charles Scribner's Sons.

HITHERTO we have regarded the introduction of an unknown novelist by one of established reputation as the expression of a kindly desire to give the struggling confrère a good send-off, to induce the public to buy his book and afterwards to read it. In his introduction to 'An Odd Situation,' Sir Walter Besant convinces us that this view of the matter is narrow, if not quite wrong, and shows that the literary introducer is under no obligation to confine his attention either to the person or the thing ostensibly to be introduced. On the contrary, he may detach himself from the supposed subject of discourse and free his brain of whatever burning thoughts happen at the moment to be demanding utterance. When Sir Walter Besant undertook to introduce Mr. Stanley Waterloo and his work, the pressure of accumulated information about the city of Chicago was apparently more than he could bear. He was feeling that the ignorance of the British public about Chicago was intolerable and must be enlightened, no matter under what pretext or at whose expense. So he proceeded to write an historical sketch uniting the Chicago of sixty years ago, "a kind of barbican, or advanced post, against the red Indians," with the Chicago of last April, which, we infer from his description, was then a kind of Athens, or last defence of refinement and cultivation against barbarians of whatever color. His appreciation of the greatness of Chicago is really very affecting, and, "given" all the facilities and capacities which he says must be "given," we see no reason for dissenting from his reflection that "it would be strange indeed if there did not come out of all this a growth of literature worthy of joining the literature of Shakspere, Milton," etc.

Probably no deprecating protest will be heard except, perhaps, from Mr. Stanley Waterloo, who may feel that his story will be judged as an illustration of the progress already made by Chicago towards a juncture with the great English literature. One cannot help sympathizing with the unfortunate gentleman for having been used as a milestone, for there is nothing in his work to suggest a vanity so complacent as to claim, or an ambition so vaulting as to covet, such distinction. The story is written in the first person, and the narrator frequently regrets that he has not the skill to make it as interesting in the telling as it was in the living. The regret will be perfectly comprehensible to most readers and ungrudgingly approved by all. The characters are plain farmers—very plain, indeed—slow in talk, sober in reflection, very genuinely uninteresting. The incidents, chiefly relating to the annoyance inflicted on those farmers whose lands lie partly in the United States and partly in Canada, are not exciting. A gift of humor might have saved the tale, but Mr. Stanley Waterloo of Chicago lacks that as completely as the gift of narrative. Sir Walter Besant, having arrived at his author in the last paragraph of the introduction, says cautiously that it is not his business to speak in commendation of the book. There we differ with him without apology, and say that, in the premises, it is rather more his business than to "boom" Chicago or any literary group or publishers therein. If he could not praise Mr. Waterloo, he should have let him alone and confided his precious impressions to a railway bill or other advertising medium.

Such shabby treatment of an author by an introducer is, we believe, unparalleled, for it is equivalent to announcing that there is nothing in the book to praise, and is therefore grossly unjust to Mr. Waterloo. Few authors have a finer or juster sentiment for nature, and very few are so modest, serious, and sincere. Moreover, he is instructive, having gone rather deeply into the effect of perpetual fried pork and pie on the body and mind of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American rustic. His conclusions on this vital issue are admirably acute. Equally just, and supported by neat little parallel columns of statistics, are his reflections on the absurdity and positive harmfulness of the invisible customs line between the United States and Canada. Canada appears to be the chief sufferer, and the political argument tends to indicate her folly in preserving allegiance to the Empire. Putting one thing together with another, we have a suspicion that the loyal British novelist may not have read the book he introduces.

The transportation of a magnificent primitive female, a daughter of nature, from a mountain fastness or isle of the ocean to a giddy centre of fashion is a favorite operation in fiction. Long ago Mr. Black performed it successfully in 'A Princess of Thule,' and recently Mr. Meredith has done it vigorously and volubly. As a matter of fact, no woman ever inspired the same sort of sentiment as a mountain or a cataract—an abstract, impersonal sentiment exclusive of sympathy; and the sight of one whose appearance actually did suggest such objects would probably inspire more dismay than admiration. Against the few successes in humanizing a dryad, nymph, or mermaid may be scored innumerable failures, and of these none more complete than "A Mountain Woman," the first of a volume of short stories by Elia W. Peattie. This author has not shown discrimination in giving the first place to the stolid, enigmatical lady, described by an ardent lover as a "remnant left over from the heroic ages." All the subsequent tales, some soberly realistic and some pleasingly fantastic, are infinitely better, both in idea and in treatment. "Jim Lacy's Waterloo" is an impressive sketch of the trials that encompass the farmer in Nebraska, and the horrors of loneliness and thankless labor that frequently drive mad the farmer's wife. It is easy to see why a man with Lacy's strong passions and limited intelligence should fall on the Government and Eastern capitalists as responsible for untimely drought, the casual cyclone, dear transportation, and low prices. He must vent his bitter disappointment on something tangible, or curse God and die. His raving about the relation between fiat money and universal prosperity is just as much like argument as is the familiar declamation of the professional Populist orator. The assumption is false and the words are foolish, but in Lacy's case, as in many others, the facts behind are tragic. The remaining stories of the volume have a pathetic strain, with enough lightness to mitigate the hopelessness of "Lacy's Waterloo."

Mr. Bunner's last volume, entitled 'Jersey Street and Jersey Lane,' includes reminiscences of the New York of his boyhood, sketches of life seen from his office window, and some incidents of suburban life, trivial in themselves, but of absorbing interest to the participators. The work, with its casual narrative and accompanying serious or humorous reflection, is that of an essayist—work in which Mr. Bunner was not so perfectly at home as in verse or fiction. It is all pleasant and smooth and supremely tolerant, but there is something lacking, and we think that something is control of his subject and spontaneity, both characteristic qualities of most of his work. In some of the sketches the matter is a little thin; only a very accomplished essayist could use it effectively without seeming to strain points and to be finding the affair rather tiresome. In others, noticeably "The Bowery and Bohemia," there is a surplus of matter, and here we find a failure of synthesis and concentration. The knowledge and the feeling for a great picture of New York's most famous highway are both evident, but the composition is capricious and scrappy, the impression is tantalizingly incomplete, and the reader feels that the Bowery has just missed a chance of assured immortality.

Proportional Representation. By John R. Commons. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

Mr. COMMONS gives a fair account of the origin, progress, and present condition of the movement for minority or proportional representation, now nearly forty years before the public. The conclusions which the story seems to establish are, first, that there is no great difficulty in making a proportional system work so as to produce a legislative body in which the numerical relations between the parties will reflect pretty accurately those in the electorate; second, that the other results predicted for it have never been attained. Its advocates in this country have always made the mistake of expecting too much from it. See, they say, what a shocking condition our legislatures are in: assemblies of unknown, ignorant, corrupt men, legislating in the interest of jobs and at the dictation of a boss—why do we not find our best men there? Why do we not elect our leading lawyers, merchants, publicists, scientific men? What is it that keeps such men out? The answer they give is, that the whole thing is due to a single cause—the fact that the voter, by the present system of representation, is compelled to choose between one of two party tickets, the names on which he has little or no voice in selecting. It ought to be possible for him in a free country to vote for any one he desires to see elected. Give him the combination of the "cumulative vote" and the "free ticket," says Mr. Commons, and he will vote freely, put good men in nomination, fill our legislatures with them, and redeem the country.

Now, as a matter of fact, wherever any sort of proportional representation has been introduced, as, for instance, in Illinois, where the cumulative vote has been on trial for twenty years, no difference in the character of the representation has been produced. The nominations are the old party nominations, and the Legislature is the same old body that it always was. Ah, it is said in reply, but that is because the cumulative system is not the true plan. Under it the party is still supreme; a plan must be introduced which will make the individual independent of party. A slight change in the machinery will do that. But the difficulty about the whole matter is that the argument rests on the assumption that the voter wants to be independent of party, and of this there is very little evidence. All the evidence brought forward in this book is that wherever any sort of proportional representation is introduced, what the voter tries to do, and usually succeeds in doing, is to make it tell, not in the way of freeing himself from party, but of getting all the advantage out of it he can for his party. Moreover, there is nothing in the present system to prevent voters, say in a city like New York—a community more important in population and wealth than most of the States—from combining together and putting up independent candidates. Not only this, but it has been demonstrated over and over again that, by combining against both parties, an independent mayor can be elected. How often is it done?

The fact is, and no political system can afford to ignore it, that the natural inclination of the average man is not to be independent, and spend his time thinking and consulting with his friends and neighbors as to who is the best person for mayor or representative or even coroner; but to let some one else do it for him, while he shelters himself behind the Party in whose name it is done. An obscure person—and the greater part of the human race are still obscure—gives himself importance by being able to label himself Republican or Democrat. It connects him with a great historical organization, a nation within a nation. Independence of character and mind is exceptional; independent movements are exceptional; and even when independent persons unite for a temporary object, their independence will drive them apart again when that object is attained.

This very peculiarity of human nature no doubt makes it all the more important that every opportunity for independent action in politics should be given, and it need hardly be said that we are in favor of reinforcing motives to independence wherever they exist; but it seems to be still an open question whether any system of proportional representation yet invented does tend in the direction of independence or not. One thing is quite clear, that a system difficult to understand cannot encourage independence, because one reason why people are not independent is on account of the mental effort it costs. One great beauty of party is that it saves mental effort and study. Now for anybody to make an intelligent use of the combination of the cumulative vote and the free ticket requires a good deal of mental effort, and the average voter will not make it. The people who will make it are the party managers, but not in the interest of independence. To sum up the whole matter, the impression produced on our mind by the arguments and by the evidence of Mr. Commons is precisely the opposite of that which he seeks to produce. It is that the general tendency of the elaborate system of proportional representation which he recommends would be to increase rather than to diminish the hold of the party managers on the great mass of voters.

The Ouananiche and its Canadian Environment. By E. T. D. Chambers. Harper & Bros. 1896. 8vo, pp. xxii, 357, illustrated.

OUANANICHE is a Canadian name, from the Montagnais Indian, applied to the common salmon of eastern North America. Individuals that reach the sea change slightly in appearance, and then are differently named. The landlocked salmon, so called, of New England and the ouananiche of the region to the northward differ only in name. Excepting an occasional outside excursion, the territory covered by Mr. Chambers's book is the great Labrador peninsula, and attention is directed chiefly to the region about Lake St. John. The author is more than a contemplative angler and a good writer; he is a careful student and an excellent observer. By scientific treatment of his subject he has produced one of the most valuable works in the literature of angling. Beyond the direct interests of the angler, immediately relating to the salmon, their haunts, habits, capture, and fellows in the waters, it contains the latest information regarding the country, with the best accounts of the scenery, routes, guides,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or game, and a chapter on the Montagnais, their folklore and their language. With frequent glimpses of forests and lakes and streams, hardly yet explored, which year by year attract greater numbers of our brethren to the other side of the St. Lawrence in pursuit of adventure, sport, or recreation, the pages are enlivened by vivid portrayals of scenes in the wilderness telling of the perils of navigation, of the skill of the guides, of the struggles with the game, of the blessed freedom from restraint, of the wild men and the abundance of wild things in the midst of the wildest surroundings, in such terms as surely will quicken the pulses of men whose souls inspire in sympathy with that of nature. Tourists and lovers of the rod and gun have special reason to be grateful to Mr. Chambers.

There are repetitions, and it would be strange if there were not. The book is something too long. It would have been more readable if divided into two parts; the diversity of subject-matter, and the fact that nearly every chapter is an essay in itself, making such a division practicable. Apart from these minor faults we have noted one or two unimportant inaccuracies, born of the writer's enthusiasm for his subject. One could wish that he had devoted more space to the final chapter, on the Montagnais Indians. This tribe, until the most recent times, has been almost unknown to the world outside of the Hudson's Bay trappers and traders, and, in its unenlightened savagery and strange traditions, its tenacity of ancient customs and wild and unexplored habitat, offers a more interesting study to-day than does any other North American tribe.

The Works of Max Beerbohm. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896.

We have here seven essays in a light vein. They could have been produced only by the life of London, and London essays they emphatically are. The best of them, "The Pervasion of Rouge," is in praise of Artifice. Everything about it is artificial, the style, the subject, and the ideas. Yet it is based upon an underlying truth which redeems it from absurdity. Hardly any one can question that there is a tendency to reaction in many quarters against the worship of nature which marked the taste of a previous generation. Especially is this true of London, where from time to time a cult—such, for instance, as that of æstheticism—breaks out without rhyme or reason, except that it is in some way connected with art—art being in these cases merely a particular kind of artificiality. Euphuism in the Elizabethan period must have been produced by the same sort of fashionable reaction in favor of the artificial. According to Mr. Beerbohm, rouge and the paste-pot are coming in again as a protest against too much nature; and being, in this field, a reformer, he predicts all sorts of good results. One of them is that the face will no longer be regarded as a vulgar test of character or emotion—a view which tends to "degrade the face æsthetically"—but as something to be prepared by its owner as a thing of beauty for the delectation of observers. Not only this, but the face, well painted and rouged, being no longer a thermometer of the emotions, literature will have to give us real psychological studies in order to make us know what goes on in the mind and heart. A blush, for instance, will no longer mean anything as an indication of shame; a sudden paleness, as the index of fear, will be out of the question. Thus soul will be separated from face, and one will cease to be a mere key for the study of the other. Besides, of all kinds of artifice, surely self-beautification is one of those most obviously suggested by reason and instinct. This, it may be said, raises the question whether such artifice is not open to the objection that it is natural; but the difficulty will be insisted on only by pettifoggers.

Mr. Beerbohm's volume is one of conceits, marked by a good deal of humor and cleverness, and marred by the single fault that he has little or nothing to say. Under these circumstances it is not without reason that he sings the praises of the artificial.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Amram, D. W. The Jewish Law of Divorce according to Bible and Talmud. Philadelphia: Edward Stern & Co.
Balzac, H. de. Modeste Mignon.—The Rise and Fall of César Birotteau. Macmillan. 2 vols. Each $1.50.
Barss, J. E. Cornelius Nepos: Selected Lives. Macmillan. 40c.
Chetwood, J., jr. Immigration Fallacies. Boston: *Arena* Publishing Co. 75c.
Daudet, A. Thirty Years of Paris and of My Literary Life. London: Dent; New York: Macmillan. $1.
Edwards, Rev J. T. Addresses: Educational, Political, Scientific, Religious. Eaton & Mains.
Field, E. Revolutionary Defences in Rhode Island. Providence: Preston & Rounds. $2.25
Hill, C. S. The Chicago Drainage Channel. New York: *Engineering News* Publishing Co. $1.50.
History of Banking in all the Leading Nations. Vol. iii. New York: *The Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin.*
Houssaye, A. Souvenirs de Jeunesse. Paris: E. Flammarion; New York: Brentano's
How, W. W., and Leigh, H. D. History of Rome to the Death of Cæsar. Longmans. $3.
Kölbing, E. Lord Byron's Werke. 2 vols. The Siege of Corinth.—The Prisoner of Chillon, and Other Poems. Weimar: Emil Felber; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Larison, Dr. C. W. Elements of Orthoepy. Ringoes, N. J.: Fonic Publishing House.
Le Soudier, H. Bibliographie Française: Recueil de Catalogues des Éditeurs Français, accompagné d'une table alphabétique par noms d'auteurs et d'une table systématique. 6 vols. Paris: H. Le Soudier; New York: Lemcke & Buechner. $19.50.
Life and Speeches of William J. Bryan and Arthur Sewall. New York: J. S. Ogilvie Publishing Co. 25c.
Lindsey, W. Cinder-path Tales. Boston: Copeland & Day. $1.
Lydekker, R. A Geographical History of Mammals. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press; New York: Macmillan. $2.60.
McCarthy, J. Pope Leo XIII. Frederick Warne & Co. $1.25.
Miller, Prof K. Die Aeltesten Weltkarten. Part 4. Die Herefordkarte. Stuttgart: Roth; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Morley, J. Life of Richard Cobden. New ed. 2 vols. Macmillan. $3.
Moulton, Prof. R. G. Genesis. Macmillan. 50c.
Mühlbrecht, O. Die Bücherliebhaberei (Bibliophilie—Bibliomanie) am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Puttkammer & Mühlbrecht: New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Munro, J. The Story of Electricity. D. Appleton & Co.
Newberry, Fanny E. Strange Conditions. Boston: A. I. Bradley & Co. $1.25.
Nichols, E. H. Elementary and Constitutional Geometry. Longmans, Green & Co. 75c.
O'Reil, Max. John Bull & Co. Cassell Publishing Co. 50c.
Pollock, Sir F. First Book of Jurisprudence for Students of the Common Law. Macmillan. $1.75.
Pontoppidan, H. The Promised Land. London: Dent; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Robertson, Prof G. C. Elements of Psychology. Scribners. $1.
Robinson, Rev. J. B. The New Woman, and Other Poems. Chicago: C. M. Barnes Co. 75c.
Rolfe, W. J. Shakspere the Boy. Harper & Bros. $1.25.
Sangster, Margaret E. With My Neighbors. Harper & Bros. $1.25.
Schönbach, A. E. Walther von der Vogelweide. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co.; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Selborne, Earl Memorials. Part I. Family and Personal. 1766-1865. 2 vols. Macmillan. $8.
Social Observances. Frederick Warne & Co. $1.
Socio Economic Mythes and Mythe-Makers. Boston: *Arena* Publishing Co.
Tennyson, A. Rizpah, and Other Poems.—The Voyage of Maeldune, and Other Poems. Macmillan. 2 vols. Each 45c.
Thomas, Rev L. B. The Thomas Book: Genealogies of Sir Rhys ap Thomas, K. G., the Thomas Family descended from him, and of some Allied Families. New York: Henry T. Thomas Co.
Thurston, I. T. Don Malcolm. Boston: A. I. Bradley & Co. $1.25.
Titcuenor, E. B. Outline of Psychology. Macmillan. $1.90
Usher, E. P. Protestantism: A Study in the Direction of Religious Truth and Christian Unity. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.50.
Wotton, Mabel E. Day-Books. London: John Lane; Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.
Zittel, Prof. K. A. von. Text-book of Palæontology. Vol. I., part 1. Macmillan. $2.75.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

Have Just Published

7th Edition, Entirely Re-written, of

Martin's The Human Body

American Science Series—Advanced Course. 685 pp. 8vo, $2.50, *net.*

Considerable new matter, especially in connection with the cardiac and vascular nerves and the physiology of the brain has been added, and throughout the book, new material from the discoveries of the last three or four years has been included.

Hertwig's Zoology.

General Principles of Zoology. By Prof. Richard Hertwig of the University of Munich. Translated by Prof. Geo. W. Field of Brown University. 226 pp. 8vo. $1.60 *net.*

Traverses historically the chief problems of zoology, and discusses the main generalizations of the science without any detailed survey of the animal kingdom. Contents: History of Zoology, General Anatomy, General Embryology, Inter relations of Animals and Plants, Geographical Distribution of Animals.

Pierce's Physics Problems.

Problems in Elementary Physics. By E. Dana Pierce of the Hotchkiss School. 194 pp. 12mo. 60c., *net.*

Some 1,200 classified and graded numerical problems for secondary schools, capable of easy illustration under ordinary laboratory conditions.

*** *The publishers' descriptive list of works in Science and Mathematics, or of Works in General Literature, free.*

RECENTLY PUBLISHED IN GERMAN

Der Pratische Deutsche

By U. Jos. Beiley. Der Pratische Deutsche is arranged after the plan of Paul Bercy's Le Français Pratique, but it is by no means a mere translation of that book. The original plan has been preserved, but the exercises reconstructed and fitted to the particular needs of the student of German. The aim has been to provide the material necessary to enable the learner to converse with Germans in their own language, and to arrange it in such an order that the study will be pleasurable as well as profitable. Roman type is used throughout, excepting with the first two lessons, and a Vocabulary is at the end of the volume.

12mo, cloth, 251 pages, $1.00.

Complete catalogue on application. For sale by all booksellers, or postpaid on receipt of price by the publisher

WILLIAM R. JENKINS

851 and 853 Sixth Ave. (48th St.), New York.

Books of To-day and 'Belinda' Supt.

The Best Monthly Review of English Books for American Readers.

Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d., post free.

HATCHARDS,

Booksellers to the Queen,

187 Piccadilly, London.

YALE MIXTURE.

The choicest tobacco made, and pre-eminently a gentleman's smoke.

Marburg Bros., The American Tobacco Co., Successor, Baltimore, Md.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED